

lliant  
good  
your  
er of  
elves  
will  
'resi-  
ntino  
im.  
ause  
r of

and  
ation  
uary  
M.  
rown  
ence  
es to  
rious  
y the  
r of  
each-  
Mass  
ed by  
il of  
chool  
other  
Rev.  
don,  
own,  
t the  
Mac-  
inity  
seful  
yclo-  
sable

chool  
n  
esuit-  
neran  
ool in  
ution  
there  
since  
after  
pos-  
ident.  
o that  
ty to  
n the

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXXII, No. 22  
WHOLE No. 808

March 14, 1925

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE .....	505-508
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Looking for Catholic Carnegies—St. Patrick's Day Musings—Christian Joy and Pagan Sadness—"Express Yourself"—Watching the Stars .....	509-516
COMMUNICATIONS .....	517
EDITORIALS	
The Malines Conferences—The President's Message—Whiskey and Labor Injunctions—Congress and Other Legislatures.....	518-520
LITERATURE	
Favoring the Moderate Modernists—The Spirit of St. Patrick—Reviews—Books and Authors.....	520-524
SOCIOLOGY	
Automatic Heart Valves and Educated Tear Ducts .....	525-526
EDUCATION	
Dr Meiklejohn's "New College".....	526-527
NOTE AND COMMENT.....	527-528

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—Probably the largest inauguration day audience in history listened to Mr. Coolidge's inaugural speech, for it is estimated that ten million people heard him on the radio. The ceremonies of the inauguration itself were traditionally simple, and the oath of office was administered to the President on the east front of the Capitol by Chief Justice William H. Taft. The President, in his speech, outlined the policies which he proposes to follow in the next four years. The principal subjects touched upon by him in his speech were America's lead in world affairs, and an endorsement of the World Court; and in domestic affairs, the necessity of economy and of tax reform. The speech was summed up in these words: "Here stands our country—an example of tranquillity at home, a patron of tranquillity abroad."

The New York Times thus sums up the problems of government which confronted President Coolidge on the outset of his new administration.

"Strict economy. Maintenance of protective tariff rates. Revival of the Mellon plan for tax reduction,

especially with reference to surtaxes. Aid to agriculture in line with the recommendations of the President's Agricultural Commission. Further legislation to consolidate railways into larger systems. This carries with it the President's opposition to revising the method now used of railway valuation for rate making purposes. Insistence upon the payment of war and post-war indebtedness to the United States. American adhesion, with reservations, to the League of Nations protocol establishing the World Court at The Hague. Modification of the system under which the Railway Labor Board operates in seeking to adjust disputes between railway executives and their employees. Provision for the codification of international law. A sympathetic attitude toward the proposal to outlaw war. Provision for bringing postmasters of the first, second and third classes under the protection of the classified service. Reorganization of the Government departments. Promotion of the scheme to build the St. Lawrence Waterway connecting the Great Lakes with the Atlantic, and various other waterway projects. Separation of the functions of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. Provision for the payment of the French spoliation claims."

An unconventional incident of the inauguration took place in the Senate at the induction to office of Vice-President Dawes. Mr. Dawes' speech was a vigorous attack on some of the Senate rules which permit filibusters, and the killing, by a minority, of legislation desired by a majority. The Vice-President's speech caused a profound sensation and was received with resentment by many of those present. Later comment on the speech varies from agreement with Mr. Dawes' criticisms to declarations of the Senate's independence, and the defense of the Senate's rules as an admirable preservative from being stampeded into hasty and unwise legislation.

**Canada.**—The House of Commons, on March 3, ratified two treaties between Canada and the United States, signed at Washington by Ernest Lapointe on behalf of the Dominion. The first treaty deals with smuggling operations and illegal drug traffic along the international border. Practically all the speakers who took part in the debate insisted that the contraband trade had become a veritable

danger to the country and that the Government should do all in its power to suppress it. The Minister of Customs has stated that he will ask the House for authority to employ a special squad of officers to enforce the treaty. The second treaty enlarges the number of extraditable crimes, committed either in the United States or Canada, over those mentioned in the compacts between Great Britain and the United States in 1899, 1900, 1905 and 1922. On the present extraditable list are placed crimes against the narcotic laws, mentioned in the first treaty.

It is quite certain, according to *L'Action Catholique*, that the Shaw bill modifying the divorce laws in such a manner as to give the same facilities to the woman as to the man, will pass both Houses of Parliament. In the second reading, the lower House cast a vote of 109 to

69 in favor of the measure. The bill has given rise to a lengthy debate on the whole question of divorce. Those supporting the measure base their claims on the right of equality between the sexes. The leaders of the three political parties, and with few exceptions, the Progressives and Conservatives, have signified their approval of the enlargement of the divorce laws. Some English-speaking members allied themselves with the French-Canadian deputies who voted *en bloc* against the Shaw bill. These latter in their addresses have denounced divorce in general and have characterized the proposed measure as an open door through which greater evils will come. At present, the law on divorce differs in the various Provinces. In the four Western Provinces a man may obtain a divorce for the single reason of unfaithfulness, while a woman must, in addition, prove desertion for two years or serious ill-treatment. Quebec and Ontario do not permit the courts to grant divorce. The Maritime Provinces accept the same reasons for both sexes.

Confirmation of Premier Ferguson's proposal to mitigate the Ontario Temperance Act was given on March 4 when the Ontario Legislature by a vote of 85 to 26 approved of that part of the speech

from the Throne in which the Government announced its intention of introducing a bill providing for the sale of beer containing a greater alcoholic percentage. The present law sets the alcoholic content at 2.5 per cent. In the new measure it is proposed to increase this to 4.4 per cent. While the bill inaugurating this change has not yet been introduced, it is felt that there will be no determined opposition to its passage. In the recent vote, the Conservatives as a whole supported the Government, and many Liberal and Labor members were in agreement. Throughout the Province, the question is causing great agitation.

France.—The death of Friedrich Ebert, President of the German Republic, has caused a great deal of uneasiness

in France as to the future policy of the Republic. True, a new presidential election is scheduled for this month, but France felt that as long as President Ebert could be counted upon as a possible candidate, there was hope for the continuance of the Republican régime. It is thought that Ebert sincerely endeavored to meet the obligations of the Reich to Europe through the working of the Dawes plan of which he was a supporter from the beginning. Then too, the late President was the last representative in the present German Government of those who had been with the Republic from its inception after the revolution in 1918. He formed a link with the first days of the German Republic when sentiment was so strong against the Monarchy. For all these reasons Ebert enjoyed the confidence of France as does no other man connected with the present German Government. What will be from now on the policy of the Reich France is afraid to say, but the Government is very apprehensive.

On March 3, Marshal Foch presented his report of the findings of the Allied Military Commission to the Conference of Ambassadors convened at Paris. After

divulging further details than those already published of the military condition of the Reich, the report went on with the recommendations of the Marshal as to the best method of coping with the difficulty. Some of the details of the report were to the effect that there is not a single simple soldier in the Reichswehr or German army, but that the men are all officers, commissioned or non-commissioned, of the former German army. Further, the Marshal speaks in his report of a secret semi-military organization of German youth who obtain training comparable to the first few months' training of the old German army. With the officers mentioned above who are trained not for the ranks, but for commanding troops and with these partially trained young men, Marshal Foch argues that the Reich has the framework now for an efficient army of 500,000 or 600,000 men. Over and above this the report points to the 250 officers of the German General Staff, which in numbers is only sixty less than the General Staff of the old army of the Kaiser.

Marshal Foch recommended to the conference of the Ambassadors, that instead of seeking about for ways and means of preventing Germany from infringing upon the requirements of the Versailles treaty

with regard to disarmament, the Ambassadors adopt the far more efficient method of meeting the emergency, namely the provision of such means of security as will counteract any measures Germany might illegally take for the organization of her army. It is impossible, the Marshal thinks, to prevent a people of some 60,000,000 inhabitants from developing some sort of an army if they are determined to do so.

#### Regrets for Ebert

#### German Disarmament

#### Foch's Recommendations



The only way of meeting the emergency is by the provision of counter securities.

An effort was therefore made in the Conference of the Ambassadors by Marshal Foch and the French Government to bring into immediate discussion a treaty for the security of France against Germany to meet the alleged illegal development of the German army. But this step was blocked by the British. Owing to their influence it was declared in the conference that the recommendations for security as set forth by the Marshal were not exactly what was needed, and they demanded a reconsideration of the German disarmament problem by the Marshal and the Interallied High Military Commission with the detailed report on the technical measures to be adopted to prevent Germany from technically infringing upon the injunctions of the Versailles treaty. Thus once more is brought out the difference of the French and British viewpoint: Marshal Foch, the French Government and a growing body of French public opinion are coming to put less and less reliance upon any technical measures for the enforcement of Germany into disarmament according to the Versailles treaty; what they want is protection and security from without against anything that Germany might do in this regard.

Furthermore, the French Nationalist group and a large percentage of the followers of Herriot are set against the recent proposals on security offered by the German Government, because these omit the question of the Eastern boundaries. For France has a whole system of alliances with the Poles and the Czechoslovaks, and although she strongly desires a security compact with England, this compact must include the frontiers of her Allies. But England is not so interested about Eastern Europe, and France equally with Poland fears that the British Government might be inclined to lend an ear to the German proposals that the Eastern frontiers of the Reich be excluded from any compact for security. The Poles are especially excited over this matter as the corridor to the sea comes into the question and they are insistent that no reconsideration of the treaty of Versailles on this point be considered, nor on any point referring to the national boundaries.

**Germany.**—Germany remains quiet, though somewhat uneasy, in the days following the sudden death of the President. The funeral itself took place on a day set aside by the Nationalists for mourning the dead of the Great War, and this demonstration was instinctively turned by the people into one for the Republic itself. After the first bewilderment had passed, all minds were turned on the question of Ebert's successor. Naturally, every party

has a candidate to put forward. These ranged from Hindenburg, Mackensen, Tirpitz, and Bulow on the extreme right, through Marx and Luther in the center, to Clara Zetkin, the leader of the Communists. The election itself is set for March 29, and the forecast is for a vivid and excited campaign. It is not expected that the death of Ebert will lead to the disorder and confusion which was much feared. The Nationalists have kept very quiet and friends of the Republic are not fearful of any overturn. Doubt, however, is expressed in many quarters that a successor will be found for Ebert who will equal his stabilizing and tranquilizing ability. It is worthy of note that, to be elected, a candidate must receive an absolute majority, that is, more than half the total number of votes cast.

**Great Britain.**—On the eve of his departure to Paris for the security discussion, Austen Chamberlain made an address before the House of Commons that indicated, in a discreet way, a new turn in the Government policy concerning the Continent. H. A. L. Fisher, in opening a debate on foreign policy, had expressed his opposition to a compact between Great Britain, France and Belgium, asserting that it would inevitably divide Europe into two armed camps. He likewise expressed the hope that the Government would not present "a blank and sterile negative" in respect to the Geneva protocol of disarmament. In his reply, Mr. Chamberlain guardedly hinted at Government opposition to the proposed security pact with Belgium, France and the French allies, Poland and Czechoslovakia. He declared that Great Britain, however, could not follow an isolation policy and that it would welcome German suggestions as to the problem of security. He approved of Viscount Grey's statement that "security was the master-key to the difficult problem of Western Europe." In regard to the British occupation of Cologne, he stated that the Government could consider no evacuation proposals until Germany complied with certain substantial measures of disarmament. In the course of Mr. Chamberlain's speech an incident occurred that may have some domestic political importance. Its origin was in itself trivial. David Kirkwood, Labor member, who was mentioned last week in connection with the Labor attack on the proposed tour of the Prince of Wales, frequently interrupted Mr. Chamberlain in his address. In a parliamentary way, the Speaker indicated that Mr. Kirkwood should leave the House. When Ramsay MacDonald attempted to defend Mr. Kirkwood, the Speaker refused to permit any explanation and a motion was introduced as to Mr. Kirkwood's suspension. Whereupon Mr. MacDonald, as leader of the Opposition, together with all the members of the Labor Party, left the Chamber as a protest. Such an action has been declared unprecedented in the House of Commons in as much as it disputed the authority of the Speaker of the House.

#### French Security

#### German Proposals Rejected

#### After the Death of Ebert

#### England and the Continent

**Ireland.**—Contrary to expectation, the Senate has shown itself unfavorable to the recent resolution of the Dail on divorce. As was recorded in the issue of AMERICA for February 21, the Dail, on a motion of Mr. Cosgrave, decided that there were to be no divorce facilities recognized in the Free State, and that there should be allowed no introduction of private divorce bills in the Parliament. The motion was opposed by only two members, from Trinity College. One newspaper alone, the *Irish Times*, favored the establishment of machinery for divorce proceedings; its plea was that the Cosgrave measure was an invasion of private conscience and thus a violation of the Constitution. This view, however, was denied by the entire press. The *Irish Statesman* declares, "we believe the Dail is within its rights in passing the motion," and in reference to the charge that the motion "outrages Protestant sentiment," states that "it is our belief that the views of Protestants in Ireland about divorce are practically identical with those of their Catholic fellow-countrymen." The Senate action on the divorce bill, therefore, came as a matter of surprise. Lord Glenavy, as Chairman of the Senate, ruled that the motion was out of order. He based his decision on the arguments that such a resolution was in direct conflict with the standing orders, that it was a violation of the Constitution and that it established a very dangerous precedent. Whatever future action the Senate may take, for practical purposes the question has been decided against divorce proceedings. Since a private bill for divorce would require assent from both Houses, and since the Dail is overwhelmingly opposed to such bills, no divorce decrees could be obtained.

**Italy.**—With regard to the relations of the Fascists with the various groups or organizations in opposition to them, it will be remembered that the ex-Combatants in their General Congress held at Assisi last summer passed resolutions which were openly anti-Fascist and which consequently were resented by that body. The ill-feeling between the two has been increasing ever since. The feud was brought to a head by the publication of a decree of the Government which removed from the Board of Directors of the ex-Combatants Association such officers as in the opinion of the Government are responsible for its present inimical attitude to Fascism. Further, the Association is placed in the hands of three Government officials appointed by Mussolini. As the ex-Combatants Association is administering state funds for the relief of the poor, the law gives the Italian Government power to take such measures of interference. Many charges were made in the decree against the deposed members of the Association, such as the failure to look after the interests of the Association, illegal acts to bring about their own majority in the National Assembly of last summer, etc. The Association held another National Assembly at Rome on March 5,

and it was probably to prevent trouble on this occasion that the Government took the measures mentioned above.

**Rome.**—In connection with the controversy on the suppression of the Embassy to the Vatican and the attitude thereon of Premier Herriot, the *Osservatore Romano* has a very important semi-official statement on the question of the French Protectorate in the Orient. This Protectorate of the French Government has its inception back in history. The French Kings were the first to obtain from the Sublime Porte the right to protect before the Turkish authorities Catholic religious of whatever nationality, and even Turkish subjects. These rights were conceded through the Capitulations, which had the force of international treaties. There were such Capitulations agreed on in 1535, 1604 and 1673.

Later on other nations were conceded the same powers by the Turkish Government, so that nationals of any country could claim protection either from their own Government, or from that of France or from any other European Government enjoying the privilege. This naturally reduced the influence of France, until the Holy See intervened in favor of that country. It gave to France the exclusive right of protecting Catholics in the Orient and commanded Catholics to appeal to the French authorities and not to their own representatives. So that France protected not only her own Catholic subjects, but the Catholic subjects of the other nations represented in the Orient. These rights derived from the Capitulations ceased with the ratification of the Treaty of Lausanne, by article twenty-four of which the French Protectorate in large parts of the Orient ceased to exist outside the French mandated territories.

Premier Herriot, continues the *Osservatore*, is not sufficiently acquainted with these facts, otherwise, in his recent utterances with regard to the Vatican Embassy, he would not have so misrepresented the refusal of General Sarraïl to accept the traditional "liturgical honors" in Syria, nor have belittled the services which the Holy See has rendered France in the matter of the Capitulations.

Russia still holds its place in the headlines and in the anxious thoughts of the whole world. "What about Russia?" is still a timely question. Next week, three well-qualified writers will attempt an answer, and their findings on Russia's pursuit of the Phantom of Liberty range from Death and Despair to a still small Voice of Hope.

Mr. George N. Shuster will discourse pleasantly about a problem nearer home in "A Hoosier Looks Out the Window."



## Looking for Catholic Carnegies

GEORGE BARTON

**T**HE Catholic Church in the United States at the present time is confronted by a wonderful opportunity, perhaps by such an opportunity as it has never had before and may never have again.

Protestantism is disintegrating on all sides, and the Catholic Church alone possesses the truth for which millions in this country are hungering and thirsting. But, for one reason or another it is not being presented to them, at least not in the manner in which it can be easily grasped and understood. The doctrines of the Church are Divine, but its resources are human. The capacity of the churches and seminary buildings is taxed almost to the limit and bishops, priests and nuns cannot humanly do much more than they are doing.

So it comes about that in many parts of the United States, particularly in the rural districts, Catholics have difficulty in obtaining the facilities for practising their religion, and as a consequence many become indifferent and some fall by the wayside. At the same time there are great numbers of non-Catholics, most of whom have no religious affiliations at all, who are being neglected. If means were taken to reach these two classes, the Catholics who have to be content with hearing Mass at long intervals, and the non-Catholics who are without religion, there is every reason to believe that the spiritual results would be gratifying and that the Catholic Church in the United States would experience an amazing growth.

The problem is before us, and the remedy, strange as it may sound to some, is largely within the power of the lay members of the Church.

In other words there is a crying need for a Catholic Carnegie, for a number of Catholic Carnegies. It was the shrewd ironmaster who first enunciated the principle that it was a disgrace to die rich. He started to give away his millions, but in spite of his best efforts he passed away in affluence and others of his millions are being systematically distributed by his trustees. Whether they are doing the good that he hoped for cannot be determined off-hand. But there are two lessons to be drawn from his life. The first is that no matter how lavishly rich men give to charitable, educational and religious works they rarely die impoverished as a result of such giving, and the second is that wealthy Catholics by emulating the example of their non-Catholic brethren have the opportunity of doing more good and of getting much greater results from their benefactions. So far as faith and morals and good works are concerned the Catholic Church "has the goods," as a business man would say. Also it has an organization

by which less money is wasted in promotion, distribution and over-head.

Heretofore it has not been possible for the Catholic layman to compete with his non-Catholic brethren in large benefactions. Many of them have done splendidly in the past, but for the most part they have had to battle for their wealth and it has required all they could give to sustain and build up parish organizations. But a new day has dawned. We now have some Catholic multi-millionaires. We have quite a number of Catholic millionaires and there are very many who are rich or well-to-do. Their great opportunity lies in spreading the faith along general as well as parish lines. Many of them have already done so, and their splendid work is deserving of the highest praise. But the possibilities for doing more have hardly been tapped in this wonderful country. Is it an exaggeration to say that scores will gladly respond if the opportunity is properly brought home to them?

Last year the Carnegie Corporation gave millions to various institutions; Mrs. Andrew Carnegie presented \$100,000 to Union Theological Seminary; Lotta Crabtree willed \$2,000,000 to those disabled by the World War; James B. Duke \$6,000,000 to Trinity College at Durham, North Carolina, provided it be called Duke University, a condition that was promptly complied with; George Eastman \$2,500,000 to the University of Rochester; Edward S. Harkness \$1,000,000 to Yale University; John D. Rockefeller, \$1,000,000 to Union Theological Seminary and \$1,000,000 to the restoration of Rheims Cathedral, and Mrs. Montgomery Ward \$3,000,000 to Northwestern University. These are only a few of the high lights and have no reference to the many millions that have been distributed by the various foundations established by rich Americans in their wills or otherwise.

This spirit of giving has communicated itself to some of our rich Catholics, but, of course, not in the same proportion or on the same lavish scale. For instance one layman in Philadelphia has given \$100,000 to the Catholic University at Washington; another in New Jersey has given \$450,000 to the Little Sisters of the Sick and Poor and still another \$50,000 to the Catholic Church Extension Society and to charities in New York. There are a number of others, but names are not given for fear that some really generous benefactions may be unintentionally overlooked. But the important fact is that the ice has been broken; a start has been made and there is no reason why these gifts should not become more numerous and widespread in the future.

There are three main causes which may be wonderfully helped by large contributions and they may be roughly divided under the heads of education, church building and missionary work. The poor we have always with us and they cannot be overlooked. But they are largely cared for by diocesan efforts and activity. There is scarcely a large See in the country which does not have a complete system for helping the poor, the crippled, the aged and the unfortunate of every class. The fine Catholic hospitals in various parts of the United States are a credit to the Faith. The orphan asylums, the homes for old men and women and the asylums for the blind, the deaf and dumb and the insane have been maintained from the very beginning. It is only necessary to point out their needs to get most generous responses from the rank and file, from those faithful members of the laity whose dollars and dimes have helped to build up a chain of Catholic Churches from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

With the growth of Catholics in wealth and influence and numbers we see the need of more institutions of higher learning. If Catholics are to compete with their fellow-countrymen for places on the bench and at the bar and in the learned professions generally they must have the facilities for the required education. In some places colleges and universities have been enlarged or made possible by campaigns for endowment funds. In one large city not long ago a million dollars was raised by this general kind of an appeal. It was an experiment in that community. Many of the doubting Thomas kind of Catholics shook their heads dolefully and said that it would be a failure. They said that it would be all right to have a campaign for a hospital or a home for the unfortunate, but that the faithful would not respond to a call for a Catholic college.

They were wrong as the pessimists usually are. The promoters were optimistic from the outset. But there was much speculation regarding where the money was to come from. One of the managers said: "If you raise a million dollars it will have to come chiefly, if not entirely, from rich men. The poor or the merely well-to-do will not contribute to such a cause." Another said: "If you succeed in this drive it will be by the small contributions of the poor or those who have comparatively little of this world's goods." In answer to the question: "which class will you depend upon?" one wise priest who was conspicuous in the campaign replied: "We will depend on both classes: we cannot afford to dispense with either. One must and will stimulate the other."

He was correct. There was at least one \$100,000 donation, there were several \$50,000 contributions, there were many of \$5,000 and \$1,000, but the \$25, \$50 and \$100 offerings astonished those in charge of the movement. Yet it is necessary to lean heavily on those in good circumstances for these institutions of higher education. No amount is too small to help, of course, but the mass of the people have done well in building up the system of parish schools in the cities and towns of the country.

Church building in the large cities goes on satisfactorily, thanks to self-sacrificing parishioners, but there is a crying need for churches in the South and the West and in those localities in the country where the people themselves are too poor to bear the burden alone. The least that can be done is to help them. One practise of our Protestant brethren might be copied to advantage. That is for a prosperous city parish which is out of debt to adopt and help support a country parish until the people of the new district get on their feet.

Last, and by no means least, is the need for missionary work among non-Catholics. It has been done and is being done, thanks to those bands of self-sacrificing priests who spend their lives, and frequently shorten them, in the difficult but gratifying work of carrying the light of faith to those who have been without it. There are hundreds and hundreds of communities where a Catholic priest is a curiosity. The zeal and the eloquence of the missionary is pitted against ignorance and prejudice that are almost abysmal. It seems like a hopeless task, but it is not. The need is to broaden the work.

Here then is the great opportunity for one or two or a dozen Carnegies. They cannot educate, build churches and engage personally in missionary work, but their money will give others the facilities for doing these things. And, curiously enough, the more they give the more they are likely to have. Charity in its broad sense is like love as described by the poet. He makes Juliet say that "it is as boundless as the sea; the more I give the more I have for thee."

## St. Patrick's Day Musings

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

AT a recent meeting held in a Western city to make preparations for the celebration of St. Patrick's Day by a local society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick the press record has it that their president "gave a historical sketch of the society during the Revolution, saying that not only Washington, but also Commodore 'Saucy Jack' Barry, Gen. 'Mad Anthony' Wayne, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and others were numbered among the early membership."

There is an official history of the Philadelphia Friendly Sons of St. Patrick compiled in 1892 by their historian John H. Campbell and the list of the members he offers from the Society's roll-book does not include the name of Charles Carroll or any other of the revolutionary Carrolls. They did not participate in any of the Philadelphia society's celebrations. Washington was an "adopted" member (December 18, 1781), but he attended only the dinner and an "extra" meeting of the following year. The others mentioned were "regular" members, of whom, at the organization of the Society, March 17, 1771, there were twenty-four with six "honorary" members.

We owe to the untiring research and devotion of Martin I. J. Griffin the historical details that fix the prestige of



John Barry as the "Father of the American Navy." One of Griffin's pet aversions to the repudiation of which he gave repeated and vigorous publicity was this "Saucy Jack" Commodore title for Barry. The rank of commodore was not in use in the navy until 1862, and Barry was a most staid, prosaic and impressive officer. He never drank, or used a profane word to his men; two remarkable characteristics for that age. Most of the current "history" of his personality and exploits—except Griffin's comprehensive memoir from original records—is of the Washington cherry tree variety.

Boston can claim the honor of having the record on this side of the Atlantic of the first religious celebration of St. Patrick's Day. It was in the year 1789, and, curiously enough, it was arranged by the erratic and unfortunate Abbé de la Poterie who had come from France as a chaplain on one of the ships sent to aid the Continental cause. Later he was the first priest stationed in Boston. His notice for the festival read:

On the 17th of March next there will be sung at 11 o'clock a. m. a high Mass in musick to honour St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland. All persons, particularly the Catholics, are desired to attend and join to our prayers for the propagation of the Faith.

There may have been other formal religious observances of the day, either in Philadelphia or New York, the only places where the Irish colony was numerous enough to warrant them, but no records of such survive. It is notable too that the earliest civic and social celebrations of the day were by non-Catholics. Boston leads again in this with its "Charitable Irish Society," organized in 1737, the first of its kind in the New World. It is still celebrating St. Patrick's Day. Its "188th anniversary celebration" is advertised for March 17, 1925.

In the year 1737 "several gentlemen, merchants and others of the Irish nation residing in Boston, in New England, from an affectionate and compassionate concern for their countrymen from these parts who may be reduced by sickness, Old age and other Infirmities and unforeseen accidents," met and banded themselves together in this society. It was limited, however, to "natives of Ireland, or natives of any other part of the British dominion, of Irish extraction being Protestants, and natives of Boston." It goes without saying that these limitations of membership were abolished long ago.

Other early celebrations must be credited to the officers of the British troops stationed in garrison here and of which mention is made in the papers of the time. The first of these extant is that of the military in camp at Fort William Henry, on Lake George, New York, in 1757. Another is that of 1763 at Fort Pitt, now Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. These British officers made up what they called "Knots" of the "Friendly Brothers of St. Patrick," and under their auspices the convivial gatherings were held. In the *New York Gazette* of March 13, 1769, this notice gives the call for the annual commemoration:

The Principal Knot of the Friendly Brothers of St. Patrick in

the XVIth. Regiment of Foot, will meet at Messieurs Bolton and Sigel's, on Friday, the 17th Inst., being the Patron Day of the Order at 2 o'clock to dine and transact Business. Such gentlemen in this City as are of the Order are desired to attend.

During the following years until the British finally evacuated New York similar meetings and banquets were held by various "Knots."

The day also seems to have been popular for Masonic gatherings. In 1766 a St. Patrick's lodge of Masons was instituted at Johnstown, New York, and the Grand Lodge at its meeting in Boston, on March 17, 1780, chartered another St. Patrick's Lodge, to be located at Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of New York, which follows its Philadelphia namesake in seniority among these associations, was organized in 1784 by Daniel McCormick, who was not a Catholic, and was for many years Grand High Treasurer of the New York Grand Lodge of Masons. In the list of early members of this society from 1793 to 1815 there are only five Catholics, the others being North of Ireland Protestants or their posterity. Like the Boston Society, of course, the evolution of time worked a radical change in this respect. His Eminence Cardinal Hayes has just been elected to honorary membership.

In contrast to this change and with present conditions, may be cited an ordinance passed in 1803 "to prevent improper conduct on certain days," infraction of which imposed a fine of ten dollars.

It enacted:

Be it ordained by the Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of the city of New York in Common Council convened, that, if any person shall on the seventeenth day of March commonly called St. Patrick's Day, or any other day, carry, drag through, or along the street, alley or highway within this city, or shall exhibit to public view in any street, alley or highway, or from any window, roof of any house or other building, or shall exhibit to public view in any place or in any manner within this city an effigy of St. Patrick or any other titular saint or of any person or persons whatever or any show of a similar kind whether the same is intended as an effigy of St. Patrick, or any titular saint or any person or persons, or whether the same is designed to ridicule such titular saint or any person or persons whatever.

The Philadelphia Friendly Sons of St. Patrick which from its early association with so many of the distinguished patriots of the Revolution is always looked up to as the most important St. Patrick's Day Society, was not a Catholic organization. Of its thirty founders only three were Catholics; one of these three, however, Stephen Moylan, happened to be its president. Of the sixty-six who were at the single St. Patrick's Day banquet Washington attended (1782), only six were Catholics.

To Philadelphia, Boston and New York, on the dates above recorded, must be added Charleston, South Carolina, in 1771, as the pioneer places at which organized celebrations of St. Patrick's Day were held. These were always banquets which now seem of interminable length. They began in the afternoon and often as many as thirty

toasts were proposed and "honored" in the usual oratorical and formal manner.

The custom of parading did not obtain until after the great immigration accessions of the forties. New York led in this, its greatest popularity being attained in the decade following the Civil War. There is no community now, throughout the world, wherever the English language is spoken, in which St. Patrick's Day is not commemorated in some fashion. It is the most universally observed festival in the religious and social calendar after Christmas and Easter.

St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, though now the most elaborate fane under such patronage, was not the first church in this country to be so dedicated. There were several churches in other sections placed under the protection of Ireland's patron long before Father Kohlmann, S.J., selected that title in 1809 for New York's first cathedral.

### Christian Joy and Pagan Sadness

EDWARD BERGIN, S.J.

THREE new volumes of the "Our Debt to Greece and Rome" series appeared lately, one of which, "Mythology," by Jane Ellen Harrison, seems to call for a few words of comment. It is one of the book's merits that it fixes attention upon our indebtedness to classical antiquity. That poetry and art should be set down as enriched by classical mythology was to be expected as a matter of course, but this is far from being enough for Miss Harrison. According to the account which she makes out, religion itself is deep in debt. What does the soul of man, hungry for religious truth, owe to the old theogony? Let us allow her to tell us in her own words. The following passage occurs in the chapter devoted to the conclusion:

The religious influence of the Olympian gods, mild, serene, beautiful, has been incalculable. Touched by their humanity, the Hebrew Jehovah lost much of his savagery, many of the traits he owes to the irresponsible thunderstorm. When in the Middle Ages Greek civilization and with it the figures of the Greek gods suffered eclipse, the banished ghosts of superstition came flocking back, man is hag-ridden by fear and fear engenders savagery; the Inquisition is the logical outcome of a terror-stricken conscience. His terrors can only be abated by a Renaissance, a rebirth of the old Greek habit of thinking in calm beautiful imagery.

No doubt the world is filled with spiritual starvelings, turned adrift in the universe after the glowing promises made to their fathers a few centuries ago. Some amongst these may be saying to themselves:

Great God! I'd rather be

A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn,

So might I. . .

Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea,

Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn.

To the like of these the passage may make appeal. But to those of us that think the thoughts of Teresa of Avila and Catherine of Sienna, of Pascal and Fenelon and

Thomas à Kempis, of Charles Borromeo and Vincent de Paul, such language can only cause a sinking of the heart.

Miss Harrison must know from her reading of Plato how enlightened pagans, such as Socrates, turned away in disgust from the *chronique scandaleuse* of Olympus, which not even Homer could succeed in making savory. And as for the Renaissance it ought to be a matter of familiar knowledge into what depths of degradation these pagan images of beauty can drag the spirit down when the fear of God is banished, that fear of God which the Psalmist says is the beginning of wisdom and which Christ so strongly inculcates by oft-repeated warning. Benvenuto tells it plainly enough in fact and "Romola" in fiction. And what is true of the *cinquecento* will hold for every time and place when and where paganism gets the upper-hand, and for our own age no less.

Her position is twofold. The old Greeks learned the secret of joy from their gods. The Hebrew Jehovah was brought back and mankind was again plunged into terror. This is said, not of the Puritanism of the sixteenth century, to which the remark might be thought more fitly to apply, but of the Middle Ages, that is to say, of the Christianity of a thousand years. From which the inference seems to be that our sympathies belong with the rout up on the mountainside on Walpurgis Night rather than with the worshippers in the minster below.

We have heard where all this joy of paganism came from, but where it is to be found we are not told. Surely not in the *laissez-faire* morality pictured for us in the scene which St. Augustine quotes in his "Confessions" from Terence, where the slave justifies his profligacy by the example of Jupiter's amours. The question raised is one of religion. As a religion did paganism find the way to joy? In this respect, what to Miss Harrison seems so cheerful, to others looks unutterably sad. The old Greeks cannot have had hearts like ours unless they felt their religion profoundly depressing, and that to the degree in which it was taken seriously. That such was the case there is no dearth of evidence to show in the literature which has survived. Greek life may look pretty enough on a Grecian urn, but we have to consider it now in the temples of the gods, confronted with the stern realities of life, which they had to face as well as we. It is not Christianity that is to be blamed for letting in superstition, as Miss Harrison seems to think. When Burke said, and said with truth, that "the cure for superstition is religion," he meant the Christian religion. The natural soil of superstition is the pagan heart of man. It grows upon Christianity as the mistletoe upon the oak; it belongs to Greek mythology root and branch. Christianity has not succeeded even to this day in eradicating it from every heart that professes to be Christian. Be it so. But now, in the twentieth century what there is to be found of it among Christians is as nothing compared with what exists outside, even in circles that go by the name of scientific. Enough of it can be gathered from



the remains of classical literature to match the Witches' Cauldron in the Athens of Pericles where they got their mistress. Neither was it confined to the classes of the ignorant; it appears entering into the daily habits of thought of the most enlightened dramatists, statesmen and philosophers.

Some there were among the sages who succeeded to a greater or a less degree in ridding their minds of the unholy influence of the pagan cults. Aeschylus rose to something like a pantheistic, if not a Christian, conception of the universe, in the famous line where he identifies Zeus with the forces of nature; but his religion, as it appears in his great dramas, is the reverse of joyful; neither is it free from superstition. Socrates himself, who of all will be considered to have got the most out of Greek culture, came no nearer to joy than to have groped his way to the edge of the cloud in which all paganism was enveloped. There stood the altar of the Unknown God.

This God, whom St. Paul preached to the Athenians, was the Hebrew Jehovah, the Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Adoration in spirit and truth had found its way to the Areopagus, and it renewed the face of the earth. To rise no higher than the cultural aspects of religion, is it not disheartening to see a glance cast back across Christendom into the gloom of paganism in search of something better amid the workings of a myth-making imagination, even though that imagination belongs to a people as artistically gifted as the Greeks? This would seem to be a plea for a religion of some kind, but of just what sort is not so clear. The important consideration is the negative one, that the worship of Jehovah is deprecated as an influence for evil.

It is taking a great chance to challenge the religion of the Hebrews to a competition with the religion of the Greeks. The joy of paganism and the terror of Jehovah! Where in ancient paganism can we find one of the horde of deities addressing a mortal in such words as Jehovah addressed to Abraham a thousand years before Phidias carved his Zeus: "I am thy reward exceeding great"? Where do we find a desolate mortal lifting his eyes to Olympus and exclaiming, as the Psalmist did five hundred years before Socrates: "I have lifted up my eyes to the mountains from whence help shall come to me," or, "Though I should walk in the midst of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for thou art with me"? This is in the Old Law, the Law of Fear. The old pagan could think of his gods only with a shudder. The way to have peace was to forget them. This was reduced to a science by Epicurus, whose system has left names in bad odor in our dictionaries to the present day:

. . . gods together careless of mankind.  
For they lie beside their nectar, and the bolts are hurled  
Far below them in the valley, and the clouds are lightly curled  
Round their golden houses, girdled with the gleaming world,  
Where they smile in secret, looking over wasted lands,  
Blight and famine, plague and earthquake, roaring deeps and  
fiery sands,

Clanging fights, and flaming towns, and sinking ships, and praying hands.

But they smile, they find a music centered in a doleful song  
Steaming up, a lamentation, and an ancient tale of wrong.

The gods go their way, leaving us to go ours, so we have nothing to fear from them. Such was the system of Epicurus. It is the thesis of Lucretius's great poem. Miss Harrison quotes a passage from it to show that the fear of the gods is destructive of peace; but if the quotation proves anything it is eloquent against her own thesis, for it is a confession from pagan lips that the old mythology did not bring joy to the pagan heart. But on the other hand there is nothing to show with what success the Epicureans stifled the voice of conscience. Perhaps, if the truth were told, they would have to admit that the words of the poet applied to them as well, "conscience doth make cowards of us all."

In spite of all that psychology will ever discover it is safe to say that as long as the human heart remains what it is there will be no peace on earth outside of a good conscience. This is the principle that Christianity acts on. Mere earthly happiness is not the *summum bonum* of religion; the best that is to be had here on earth demands as a pre-requisite a heart that is in tune with a better world than this. Christianity has never availed to banish sin from the earth; but in the midst of all the sinfulness it has established a haven of peace; and to such as refuse to enter, it endeavors to bring home the sense of sin by holding out fear of the judgments of God. Within that haven there are no bounds to joyousness in the service of God.

When love casts out fear we get a Francis de Sales, a Philip Neri, a Little Flower. Since Miss Harrison's book came out during Christmas week, let us think of the Story Beautiful, the tidings of great joy, which set up the panic on Olympus described by Milton in his "Ode on Christ's Nativity." What has paganism to show compared with it? Where do we find in Grecian art a face with the radiance of one of Fra Angelico's angels? Where do we find in Grecian history a hero who could have his jest with death on a red-hot gridiron? Who are the score of Grecian heroes that we could take to match, even for light-heartedness, as many saints chosen to represent each his own century, in the stretch between ourselves and Christ?

Once upon a time, in the Middle Ages, the land of Miss Harrison used to be known as "Merry England." It was of the Middle Ages that it could be said that men wrote "to make Christian men as glad as birds at the dawning for the story of salvation." Granted that in artistic excellence their writings fall far short of ancient Athens, who would dream of talking of "merry Greece?" And if England is merry England no longer, perhaps the explanation is to be found in the mind of a seventeenth century writer who, looking around him at the religious turmoil, said sadly, "this land used to be called 'merry England'."

What a stretch of the imagination is required to con-

jure up a picture of a "Jongleur of the Lord" in ancient paganism! Has Miss Harrison met anything to match him in her explorations in mythology? For the sake of contrast a passage from Father Cuthbert's "Life of St. Francis of Assisi" may bring to a close these rambling remarks which can give no more than a hint on a vast subject.

As the brethren sang [the added stanza to the Canticle of Brother Sun] the bishop and the magistrates felt themselves strangely moved: into the misty heated world of their petty rivalries and recriminations had come this song of Francis as a gentle believing spirit, and before it they grew ashamed and silent; and then they became humble and repentant; and finally as the song ended their hearts leaped to better things and they wept in their humiliation. Without argument or bargaining they held out to each other the hand of peace and parted in friendship.

It is the old story. One half the world does not know how the other half lives. Back in the Old Testament the life of the God-fearing is pictured as gloomy in Epicurean eyes. And yet the Psalmist was telling the experience of countless others, down to the present day, down to the end of time, when he exclaimed: "Oh, how great is the abundance of thy sweetness, O Lord, which thou hast hidden for those that fear thee"; and Thomas à Kempis too, when he added: "But what art thou to those that love thee? what to those that serve thee with their whole heart?"

### "Express Yourself"

MARGARET M. RYAN

"**E**XPRESS yo'self, my chile, express yo'self," was the sentiment of a song featured in a recent Broadway success, "Expressing Willie," a beguiling comedy by Rachel Crothers. In that attraction it was sung by a rabid "expressionist," but it is being sung in a lesser degree by the whole world, at least, the world that takes an active interest in the progress of culture. We are forced into the triteness of exclaiming sadly, with vague forebodings of disaster and doubtful shakings of the head, "How times have changed!"

In the old days, a desire to give expression to oneself or the creatures of one's brain was kept secret, and regarded by the afflicted one as something rather in poor taste. Not so today! The cry of all ages is "self-expression," and the younger they are the more they seem to have to express.

On the stage one was formerly regarded as a good or bad actor. Now we hear: "How subtly he expresses the inmost sincerity of his soul," or, "How intricate the workings of a mind that can give expression to such sublime thoughts," the latter said of one who wouldn't recognize a thought if he found it wandering aimlessly in the deserted corridors of his mind. In the realm of music, a genius was one who could best interpret the composer's inmost thoughts; today it would seem as if the weirder and more peculiar the interpretation, the greater the claim to fame.

Art has always been self-expression, perhaps without the artist always realizing it. Now the expressionist in art has gone beyond the ridiculous boundaries of the human understanding, and spends hours wondering by what medley of strokes and colors he can keep even the most intelligent from discovering exactly what he is trying to express. After a second glance, the sensible critic will put it down charitably as the nightmare of an unbalanced mind. Such are our futuristic painters, and they speak an expressionistic language all their own. Uncultured in the extreme is he who is not aware that three white rings on a blood-red curtain are symbolic of a human soul; nor that four purple apples resting jauntily against a vermilion mushroom represent "a maiden's prayer for success."

But saddest of all is the fate of literature, that delight of all disciples of the new thought. One has a natural reluctance to make radical experiments where his less understanding neighbors may perhaps poke fun at him, but how secure and delightful are the paths of poetry, prose and drama! Here we may drop the despised "O'Mulligan" of common life, and adopt some such elegant cognomen as "Daisy Dalimetrio Dulcet," or "Harold Parsley Fernandez." Here even may we burden a long-suffering public anonymously!

Unable to break our reading habit, we pick up a best seller, and read the twisted account of a present-day novelist's conception of life. When we have finished we look about us, and try to see if our eyes agree with the author. If we are lucky we shall throw the book aside, smile confidently, and tell the world in general that contemporary literature is going to pieces rapidly. What if we don't believe our eyes, if we don't even *try* to see? We must necessarily adopt that author's conception of life and bear the evils that are bound to result until such time as we see the light.

And the floods of poetry that are swirling rhythmically about our bewildered heads! We pick up "Sonnets to a One-legged Toad," open to page fifty-eight and read, or could swear we are reading:

O toad  
Thou sprightly sea-nymph,  
The night gropes  
Silver spots jump—  
Jump—o'er the tarn—  
Come—light—darkness—  
Eternal oblivion!

We read it again, shake our heads to drive out that sensation of being under water, glance in a dazed manner at whoever happens to be near and ask what it is all about. A question never to be answered! Say what you like, it certainly keeps us guessing. But don't worry, everybody else is guessing, too, and you need never be at a loss if you remember to narrow your eyes mysteriously, and exclaim in whispered awe, "Remarkably subtle! tremendous psychical depths!"

The peculiar part about all this writing is that it is



essentially sad. Mr. Edward J. O'Brien, who compiles a volume of each year's best short stories, finds that field very melancholy indeed and says: "It is so because it is written to satisfy prisoned emotions. It is written to heal the writer, and the writer is sad."

The expressionistic movement is to a large extent a manifestation of the "new" philosophy, which lays great stress on inhibitions, suppressed desires, dreams, the unconscious, the subconscious. These doctrines are leading to a freedom of thought that must inevitably mean freedom from mental and moral restraint.

To return to "Expressing Willie," which started all this discussion, this was a delightfully refreshing story of a small town boy who makes a fortune in tooth-paste. Surrounded at last by wealth and everything wealth can buy, he falls into a circle of fanatical expressionists who understand nothing so perfectly as the great expression of power money can give, even money made on such a vulgar commodity as tooth-paste. They urge upon Willie the necessity of expressing himself and completely pull the wool over his eyes until his boyhood sweetheart shows them to him in their true colors, at which point Willie "expresses" himself in the old-fashioned meaning of the term.

This is no condemnation of all self-expression. On the contrary, one often would like to find the means of making some people express themselves. Much genius is hidden under a natural shyness and reticence; it should be delighting the world, lifting it to a higher and truer civilization than the one of which it unwittingly boasts. The pity of it all is that we cannot come in contact with this hidden talent, and cannot escape the thoughtless and tiresome ideas of those who have nothing worth expressing. We want to argue: "If you feel that you have the real thing, the divine spark, come out with it, don't hold it back. Remember that this is the age of self-expression, that the days of repression and timidity are past and gone. 'Express yo'self, my chile, express yo'self.'"

## Watching the Stars

A. L. CORTIE, S.J., D.Sc., F.R.A.S.

**A**STRONOMY is the science which is primarily concerned with the laws of the apparent movements of the stars. It is probably the oldest, and it is the most sublime of all the natural sciences. All nature is wonderful, but the most wonderful spectacle in nature, in its appeal, not only to the specialist, but to anyone, who on a fine night will lift his eyes to the skies, is the sight of the starry firmament. Emerson said with regard to this marvelous spectacle, that if we saw it only once in a century, we should spend years in preparing for this vision. And, he adds, that when the curtain of clouds that hid the sight from the view of mankind had rolled away, the beauty of the spectacle would compel men to fall on their knees, in adoration of the God who made it.

It is well to insist upon this spiritual aspect, not only of astronomy, but of all scientific investigation. In the first place, science is studied for its own sake, and not for its merely material and useful application, though such will in all likelihood follow the pursuit of any branch of science. Natural science is based upon observation and experiment, and exact measurement. But the truly scientific man is not content with these necessary preliminaries of scientific research. His chief end and object in the study of nature is to discover the causes of phenomena, and to be able to formulate the laws which embody the processes of nature.

Let us take examples. Ptolemy could explain in an adequate manner all the apparent movements of the sun and the then-known planets, upon the supposition of an immovable central earth, by supposing them to move in subsidiary small spheres, attached each to a larger sphere. Copernicus showed that the movements could be more easily explained by supposing the sun, and not the earth, to be the center of the system. But he erroneously thought that the movements of the planets around the sun were in circles, and consequently, he, too, had, like Ptolemy, to adopt a system of smaller circles as adjuncts to the great circles, to explain perfectly the revolutions of the planets.

Next came Kepler, who by a careful study of the observations of the apparent movements of the planets, and especially of those of a famous Danish astronomer, Tycho Brahe, was enabled to enunciate three laws regarding the movements of the planets. The first states that the planets revolve round the sun, not in circles but in ellipses. In one of my classes a boy defined an ellipse to be a "squashed circle." And an ellipse is an oval or squashed circle, the degree of "squashedness" being called by the mathematician its eccentricity. Now the departure from perfect circularity of the paths of all the planets round the sun is extremely small. One of the greatest is that of Mars. Consequently, although its average distance from the earth is approximately 49,000,000 miles, it can be reduced under favorable conditions to about 34,000,000 miles, as happened last August.

Let us suppose the planet Mars to be joined to the sun by a straight line, from center to center. Kepler's second law states that in the case of all the planets, and indeed of comets, and of any bodies that revolve round the sun, this imaginary line will mark out equal areas in equal times. From this it follows that a body revolving round the sun must go faster when near the sun than when further off. In one case the area marked out would have shorter sides but a longer arc as base, and in the other case longer sides but a shorter arc as base, and it is these arcs as bases which must be passed over in equal time by the revolving body.

The third law of Kepler, called the "Harmonic Law," tells us that if you take the number representing the year of a planet and square it, and the mean distance of a planet from the sun and cube it, the quotient of these two numbers is the same for all the planets. Consequently, if the years or periods of revolution of two planets, say the

earth and Mars are known, and the mean distance of one of them is also known, then the distance of the other can easily be ascertained. That is why it is so important to find out the exact distance from the earth to the sun, so as to get the scale of distances for all the other planets. The time they take to go round the sun can be accurately observed. These laws of Kepler are empirical laws, that is, laws deduced directly from observation.

But a more generalized law was enunciated by that great mathematician and astronomer, Sir Isaac Newton, the law of universal gravitation, which states that two bodies attract one another with a force which is proportional to the product of their masses, and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them. This law gives the explanation to the movements of the planets as described in the three laws of Kepler. A whole galaxy of distinguished mathematicians have applied this law to gravitation to explain the complicated movements of the moon and of the planets; for they are not only pulled by the sun, but they pull and disturb one another in their courses round the sun. By the aid of this law, two young men, Adams in England and Leverrier in France, share the glory of having discovered the existence of the furthest planet from the sun of our system, the planet Neptune, some 3,000 millions of miles away, by pure mathematics.

There is one movement, however, of one of the planets, Mercury, the nearest planet to the Sun, that cannot be explained by Newton's law of gravitation. But it can be explained by the theory of relativity as enunciated by Einstein. His formula is a still more generalized expression for mechanical motions in the planetary spaces. It does not upset the law of gravitation but embraces it as a particular case in a more general law. Nearly eighteen hundred years have elapsed between the investigations of Ptolemy and those of Einstein, and this brief description of the progress achieved in formulating adequate laws of planetary motions, brings home to us the gradual progress in astronomical science, which follows on more perfect and more refined observations.

It is the laborious observations of star-maps, and the construction of catalogs of their relative positions in the sky, which enable astronomers to follow more accurately the apparent motions of sun, moon, and planets, using the stars as points of reference. Ptolemy in his great work, the "Almagest," gave us a catalog of stars. He flourished at Alexandria about the year A. D. 140. His catalog is founded upon one of still earlier date, that of Hipparchus, who lived about the year 125 B. C. This catalog contains the places of 1,080 stars. The more modern catalog of Argelander, published at Bonn in 1863, gives the places of over 324,000 stars visible in small telescopes in the northern heavens. The catalog is accompanied by a series of very beautiful star maps. At present some observatories in the northern and southern hemispheres are cooperating in making a photographic map of the whole heavens, which will embrace several million stars. As these plates contain

very many stars, the positions of which have been determined with extreme accuracy, the places in the sky of the other stars can be fixed by reference to these fiducial points.

For practical purposes, too, it is most important to determine the accurate positions of at least a well distributed set of stars on the celestial globe. And just as on the earth we fix the longitude of any place by reference to the meridian of Greenwich, and its latitude by its distance in arc above or below the equator, so too in the skies the celestial Greenwich is the point where the celestial equator cuts the ecliptic, which is the path of the earth round the sun, the point where the sun appears to cross the equator in Spring. Now the rotation of the earth on its axis with reference to these stars is ultimately the time-keeper by which we are enabled to set all our clocks, and which permits the wireless broadcasting stations to send out accurate time signals all over the world. It is the astronomer who, by observing the times when these clock-stars cross his meridian, enables the mariner also to determine his longitude at sea. His latitude he can compute by observing the heights in arc of those same stars above his horizon with his sextant.

Connected, too, with this question of time-determination, by means of the accurate positions of the stars on the celestial globe, is the regulation of the calendar, which so intimately concerns our social life. The very first functions of the astronomer in ancient civilizations, such as those of the Babylonians, the Greeks, and the Romans, were to settle the calendar, and determine the dates of the great religious festivals. Even nowadays, by means of the Golden Number, the Epact, and the Dominical Letter, which are dependent on the movements of the moon, we settle the date of Easter in any year, and consequently of all the other great religious festivals, according to the rules set forth in the missal. The prediction of the tides too depends upon an accurate knowledge of the relative positions of the sun, the moon, and the earth.

Again, geodesy is the science which determines the shape and the form of the earth, and particular problems of geodesy are such as concern the measurements of arcs of meridians, the determination of the boundaries of countries and of states, and the surveying of any particular region of the earth. Such operations are necessary for political or for domestic reasons, and they depend largely on astronomical observations. How intimately does the astronomer enter into our daily life! He sets our clocks for us, he regulates our calendar, he guides the traveler over unknown and unexplored regions of the earth, he surveys our countries, he sails our ships over the trackless ocean, and by predicting the tides he guides them safely in and out of port. And all these operations depend ultimately upon an accurate knowledge of the fundamental positions of the chief stars. Watching the stars has therefore been recognized in all civilizations as one of the most important occupations contributing to human progress.



## COMMUNICATIONS

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department

## "The Gospel of the Air"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

During the first week of January there was celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of the Wright Brothers' accomplishment of making a sustained flight over Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, in a heavier-than-air flying machine. In the light of the wonderful progress made in this one department of material progress, it is hard to keep the imagination of the layman in leash. Traveling 300 miles an hour, seven miles above the earth (as we have it today), is almost too much for even the undemonstrative. Then who may blame the editor, cast in the classical mold, who embellishes his comments on the event by referring to Ovid's tale of Daedalus, the wooden dove of Archytas and Pegasus, the winged steed?

But to the speculative philosopher, "The Gospel of the Air," promulgated by Mr. Harry Harper, in the *Contemporary Review* (London), has an interest all its own, aside from our mastery of material things. It is that in the development of the flying machine lies the salvation of the world. Rather, is there not a mockery in the fact that human invention, great and wonderful as it is, has had no power to change the human heart? Perhaps, in our fast-traveling age, a few words of advice written from the heart of one who lived twenty centuries ago might, because of their modern views, have an interest. Thus Seneca wrote:

*Animum debes mutare, non caelum. Licet vastum traieceris mare, licet, ut ait Vergilius noster*

*"Terraque urbesque recedant,"*  
*sequentur te, quocumque perveneris, vitia. Hoc idem querenti cuidam Socrates ait: "Quid miraris nihil tibi peregrinationes prodesset, cum te circumferas? Premit te eadem causa, quae expulit."*

This eloquent passage from the writings of the great Latin sage is thus excellently rendered in Gummere's translation:

You need a change of soul, rather than a change of skies. Though you may cross vast spaces of sea, and though, as our Virgil remarks

"Lands and cities are left astern,"  
your faults will follow you whithersoever you travel. Socrates made the same remark to one who complained; he said: "Why do you wonder that globe-trotting does not help you, seeing that you always take yourself with you? The reason which set you wandering is ever at your heels."

The Gospel of Christ, and not the "Gospel of the Air," or any other gospel of modern material progress, can lead to the salvation of mankind.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

T. J. FLAHERTY.

## The Fathers and Evolution

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Replying to Father Hornsby's letter in your issue of January 31, on "The Fathers and Evolution," in which he made both kind and critical reference to "Two Horns of the Dilemma," appearing in the issue of January 3, I must confess that the use made of the term "evolution" justified him in assuming that the writer intended to present "a 'polygenetic hypothesis' of evolution." Although the circumstantial evidence is against me, that was not my intention.

The writer has never accepted nor held any theory of evolution as an explanation of the origin of types since he began to give serious thought to the subject some years ago; but so many writers, both clerical and lay, have appeared to adopt or countenance some theory of evolution and to credit St. Augustine and other Fathers with doing the same, that it seemed better to discuss these different hypotheses as in some way related to the notion of evolution. Yet, the use of the term, particularly in this connection, does not involve "modern evolution."

The evolution that St. Augustine and earlier Fathers had to meet, reconstruct or answer, was that form of it taught by the Gnostics. S. M. Jackson describes Gnosticism as

in part a reaction of the freer pagan mind against the narrowness and poverty of Ebionism, but also, and more essentially, an inevitable product of the speculative genius of the Gentile world in its first exciting contact with the stupendous facts and doctrines of Christianity. Its elements were derived from three sources: Hellenistic idealism, Oriental pantheistic naturalism, and the Christian revelation.

Now, at the age of nineteen, Augustine, who was born in 353, embraced the doctrines of the Manichaeans which he held for about nine years, and Manichaeism was compounded mainly of Persian Dualism, Buddhism and Syrian Gnosticism, using certain Christian ideas as a gloss for a heathen philosophy. In a general way one may say that Manichaeism grew out of Gnosticism, as the one ascended while the other declined. Dualism and the idea that matter was evil were common to them both, though Gnosticism had developed more than one conception of evolution.

Among his earlier writing after he became a Catholic and was ordained at Hippo in 391, St. Augustine wrote a treatise against the Manichaeans whose philosophy he had accepted for so many years, and in refuting them he seems to have made concessions where this appeared possible, just as today in confuting a materialistic evolution concessions are often made by Catholic writers.

That in his former writings St. Augustine said some things which he wished to revise is plain from the fact that towards the end of his life he wrote the "Retractations," in which he reviewed carefully all his former works; yet these former works continue to exist and are quoted today. So there might easily exist some difference of opinion as to what St. Augustine taught concerning evolution or other subjects, depending on which of his writings happened to be the subject of study. It is difficult for all of us to specialize on St. Augustine's writings as a whole. I quite agree with Father Hornsby that "it is certainly possible for Catholic scholars to come to an agreement" and that we should "not wait for some non-Catholic scholar to step in and give us the real teaching of our most revered authors."

As a matter of fact, in my article I did not attribute any doctrine of evolution to any of the Fathers but in a general way referred to others, perhaps erroneously, as having done so. For the same reason I conceded rather than advanced a connection between the polygenetic hypothesis and evolution, for modern evolution, in as far as it is materialistic, is essentially monogenetic, and must lose its materialistic value in proportion as the monogenetic hypothesis is successfully refuted.

Garrison, N. Y.

J. A. RICHEY.

## Two Bills Before Congress

To the Editor of AMERICA:

There are two bills now before Congress which, if passed, will give the people a chance to vote on Constitutional amendments. It is to be sincerely hoped that they will be passed. For, it is about time that the people shall have some definite say in measures which concern their practical well-being. Too long have political and religious cliques dictated their selfish policies for the government of the population. The lamentable spectacle of the Eighteenth Amendment, engineered, more or less, by a select crowd of political and religious lobbyists, should arouse the solons in Washington to one momentous fact: that the people will not be fooled all the time.

It might be stated, in passing, that the new bills and a proposed constitutional convention to eliminate deadwood in the Constitution are a hark-back to the ancient Gaelic idea, according to which, as Green writes in his "Irish Nationality": "The administration was divided into the widest possible range of self-governing communities, which were bound together in a willing federation."

Lowell, Mass.

GEORGE F. O'DWYER.

# AMERICA

## A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 14, 1925

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;  
Treasurer, GERALD C. TREACY.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

### Address:

Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: Murray Hill 1635

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

### The Malines Conferences

**I**N an article in the London *Month* for February, Father Joseph Keating, S.J., discusses the Malines Conferences in his usual illuminating and trenchant style. Viewed at this distance, and with every attempt to sympathize with the group of Anglicans led by Lord Halifax, it must seem that they are trying to learn through a formidable mechanism what they could easily learn from a penny catechism. What they cannot understand, it would appear, is first, that the Catholic Church actually claims to be the one Church authorized by Jesus Christ to guide, instruct and rule the souls of men in all matters which pertain to Faith and morals, and next, that the Catholic Church cannot possibly recede from her claim, or admit that her commission may be shared by any ecclesiastical organization whatsoever.

Bishop Gore, it is true, dimly senses difficulties which even the Malines Conferences cannot overcome. "I frankly own," he writes, "that I see no way over the enormous dogmatic obstacles which Rome has interposed." This is plain speaking. We understand what the Bishop means, although Catholics would employ another terminology. What he considers "dogmatic obstacles" they consider to be the teachings of Jesus Christ, not "interposed" by "Rome" but proposed as binding upon all men by that Church whose Visible Head is the Bishop of Rome. Yet in this matter the Bishop has gone farther along the road of understanding in a short time than has Lord Halifax in a long period of weary years. The sincerity of Lord Halifax demands at least a patient hearing, but his hope during more than two generations, that the Church will in some manner as yet unknown both to him and to the Church, discover some method by which the *Goetterdaemmerung* of the Establishment may be joined with herself, is not merely futile and pathetic.

It has undoubtedly served to deter anxious souls from seeking the one Fold in which they can find the truth and with it peace.

Catholics will certainly agree that no treaty of unity between the Babel which is the Establishment and the dogmatic certainty of the Catholic Church is possible. Indeed, if the Catholic Church is the one true Church of Jesus Christ, she has no terms to offer, but must require unqualified and unreserved submission to her authority. If, again, she alone has been Divinely commissioned, no sensible person will expect her to tone down her doctrine to square with his peculiar views. But if she is not of Divine origin, why seek union with her?

Nor will any good come of the attempt to create a belief that Catholics in England are divided on the desirability of union with Anglicanism. They far better than their brethren in other lands know that this is impossible. Such efforts, although the good faith of the individuals concerned need not be impugned, merely serve to falsify the record. Catholics the world over are of one opinion on the dogmas of the unicity and the visible unity of the Church, or they are no longer Catholics. Nor will any compromise be made either in England, at Malines or at Rome. The Church cannot compromise. She knows that she and she only is the Divinely appointed guardian of the deposit of the Faith.

### The President's Message

**W**ITH the implications in the President's message to Congress that are purely political, this Review has no immediate concern. Probably the President spoke for the country when he said that our political salvation lay in our adherence to "Americanism," and he probably meant as much or as little as does the average citizen who employs this somewhat vague expression in his ordinary speech. What, precisely, that Americanism may bind us to do or counsel us to leave undone, in our relations with foreign countries, beyond the scrupulous observance of compacts already made, is not at all clear. But the people spoke in 1920 when they elected Warren Harding, and again manifested an adherence to the same purpose when they elected Calvin Coolidge in 1924. For the present, a policy of aloofness, as far as aloofness means abstention from any introduction of ourselves into the controversies and internal affairs of other nations, on plea that this is necessary to insure the peace of the world, is the American policy. New aspects, real or feigned, of old questions easily bring about, it is true, strange reversals of purpose in the political world, yet it is not probable that either the President or Congress will undertake to disturb this policy which now seems ratified by the people.

Yet it is pleasant to note that Catholics can find themselves in complete accord with those paragraphs of the President's message relating to the spiritual purposes which should animate us as a people. The scoffer and the Sadducee will receive his words with scorn. But it is



well to be reminded from time to time that our political prosperity depends upon our fidelity to religious principle and practise; that unless the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it.

America seeks no earthly empire built on force and blood. No ambition, no temptation lures her to thought of foreign dominions. The legions which she sends forth are armed not with the sword, but with the cross. The higher state to which she seeks the allegiance of all mankind is not of human but of Divine origin. She cherishes no purposes save to merit the favor of Almighty God.

Incidentally the President touched upon the question of religious persecution. While the purpose which the President had in mind was laudable, his words are, unfortunately, open to misunderstanding.

The fundamental precept of liberty is toleration. We cannot permit any inquisition either within or without the law, or apply any religious test to the holding of office. The mind of America must remain forever free.

As has been pointed out by commentators on the Constitution from Story to our own times, Americans are not "tolerated" in their right and duty to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience. They are *free* to do so, and the Federal Constitution protects them to the extent of abolishing all religious tests as a qualification for Federal office, and of forbidding Congress to make any Federal establishment of religion. "Toleration" bears the ugly implication of putting up with an evil which cannot be wholly abolished. As Story clearly shows, such was not the mind of the framers of the Constitution. If the Federal Government could be rightly said to "tolerate" any religion, it could also be said to have the power to proscribe or to establish any religion. But under the Constitution, there is no question of toleration, proscription or establishment. American citizens are free to worship Almighty God in accordance with conscience, and this freedom is deemed a right with which the Government may not interfere, and which it may approach only to protect.

The intention of the President in referring to the subject is beyond criticism. But it is important to observe that religious freedom is not an eccentricity to be borne with, but, under the Constitution, a right to be protected by the full force of the Government.

#### Whiskey and Labor Injunctions

**B**Y its decision in the Grossmann case the Supreme Court has done far more than could have been accomplished by tons of learned argument to establish the Federal Courts in the respect of the worker. The brief history of this important case is that one Philip Grossmann, a Chicago bootlegger, was enjoined by the District Federal Court, the effect of the injunction being to forbid him to ply his illegal trade of selling whiskey. Violating this injunction, Grossmann was adjudged guilty of contempt of court, and his punishment was fixed at one year in jail and a fine of \$1,000. The President released

Grossmann from imprisonment but allowed the fine to stand. Thereupon the Federal Court ordered Grossmann back to jail, declaring that the pardoning power of the President did not extend to cases of contempt. On appeal to the Supreme Court, a unanimous decision sustaining the President was rendered.

This case is an apt illustration of the manner in which justice may be flouted by combining the peculiar workings of the prohibition law with abuse of the power to commit for contempt. Grossmann was never tried for the crime of which he was accused, that of selling alcoholic liquors, for in a contempt case there is no trial. By a most unhealthy device, which does much to bring all courts into disrepute, he was first enjoined from committing a crime and then punished without trial by jury, not for his first offense against the prohibition law nor even for his second, but solely for violating the injunction of the court. It may or may not be true that Grossmann should have been punished, but the cardinal point is that trial by a jury of one's peers is supposed to be not only an ancient but a constitutional right. To put the case in other words, through the injunction it is now possible for a judge to define a degree of crime, and then to fine and imprison of his own motion, thereby constituting himself at once legislator, jury, judge and executioner. In addition, the Court in the Grossmann case, denied the power of the President to pardon.

The decision of the Supreme Court does not destroy the possibility of a recurrence of the Grossmann case, but merely guarantees the right of the President to pardon, for in his decision Chief Justice Taft affirms the right of the courts to protect themselves by warrants for contempt. While this power, even as the power of the President to pardon, can be applied improperly, examples of abuse are not of themselves a sufficient reason for withdrawal of the right so misused.

Undoubtedly the most glaring instances of abuse on part of the courts have been noted in connection with labor cases. The people will support the courts as long as they can believe in the honesty of the courts, nor will they readily condemn judicial stupidity as judicial tyranny, although the effects may be equally harmful. But for no court which temporizes with the plain requirements of justice, and for judicial procedure substitutes a legal fiction or an abuse of power, will they have any respect. Nor should they. It will be interesting to observe what action will be taken when the next labor leader finds himself in jail for contempt of court. But, both in the interests of the orderly administration of justice and of the rights of the worker, it is to be hoped that this contingency is in the far-flung future.

#### Congress and Other Legislatures

**C**ONGRESS has ceased to function for a time, a fact that might justify another Thanksgiving Day proclamation. There is additional reason for gratitude when

the observer reflects upon the many laws which Congress might have passed but did not. One measure held in abeyance was the Cramton bill, an addition to the huge mass of prohibition legislation already on the books. Another was the Sterling-Reed bill establishing Federal control of the local schools. First introduced in October, 1918, as the Smith-Towner bill, this project has traveled over a road so hard that on several occasions it was forced to change its name. A further change will ensue if the bill is again introduced, for Senator Sterling now retires to private life, or to such publicity as he may obtain as assistant editor of the *Fellowship Forum*, a journal of Klan proclivities published at Washington. Possibly there was no connection between the scheme for Federal control of the schools and the forces which have been ranged against the Catholic Church in this country, but it is now evident that the promoters of the Sterling-Reed bill knew what manner of man they chose to foster this undertaking.

Although Congress has glided into the cold and silent tomb, as Mr. Toots would say, it must not be forgotten that in more than thirty States the legislative mills are grinding both speedily and fine. About 20,000 bills are pending, and the expected result is some 5,000 new ways of becoming a law-breaker. Among the measures pending are, according to the *New York Sun*, bills requiring State examinations for beauty-doctors, bills making the use of paint-spraying machines unlawful, and bills forbidding all

noises between astronomical sunset and sunrise.

Our legislators work hard and we bear away the palm for quantity production. There are now approximately 2,000,000 laws in this country. We annually enrich the mass by about 12,000 new specimens, and if municipal ordinances be added, by 200,000. Supreme Court decisions on mooted points of constitutional laws fill 650 large volumes, and published court-reports reach an annual total of 175,000 pages. Laid end to end, the pages of our volumes of State and Federal laws could begin with the North Pole and descend in a spiral curve to cover the entire globe. Placed in that position, many would be quite as serviceable for the common good as they are at present.

It is a melancholy spectacle. How many of these ordinances are laws in truth and not merely in seeming, no man can say, since no man has ever read them all, or could and live. But they satisfy our reformers who hold that every evil can be cured by passing a law against it, and our sciolists in political science who apparently believe that all ordinances are self-enforcing. By way of contrast, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States once published a report to show that our State legislatures had passed 62,251 laws in five years, while in ten the British Parliament adopted only 1,500. But England was ever a laggard. We not only have more laws than England, but far more crime.

## Literature

### Favoring the Moderate Modernists

POETIC observers are of three distinct classes. Those of the first group are mostly young and usually "poets"; they never admit that any great poem was written prior to some ten years ago. They are solidly loyal to themselves and express their contempt for the past in blatant hubbub. The second class of observers consists mainly of college professors. They believe that the last serious poem in the English language was published somewhere about 1900. For the present, these charming classicists may be permitted to slumber in peace. Midway between these two groups is the third class that sees the best in the past and does not judge the present by the worst. This third kind will quote with enthusiasm a sonnet of Shakespeare, will grow melancholy over a bit of Keats, and will so appreciate a new poem by a new author that it will surreptitiously clip the verse from a neighbor's magazine.

In the verbal warfare that has been agitating the poetic world through recent years, those who have dug the graves of all the classical poets have talked loudest and longest, while those who think that the modern poet has not yet been born have been content to impart the misinformation to a small group of undergraduates. Occasionally the ob-

servers who are trying to steer the middle way have protested against both sets of extremists. One of these well-balanced gentlemen, Robert Underwood Johnson, a few days ago, in the annual address of the Evangeline Wilbour Foundation, in New York, delivered a salvo against the ultra-modernists, in particular the *vers-librists* and "their congeners, the futurists." Mr. Johnson ridiculed their pet phrases and reduced to logical absurdity their absurd contentions. In his summary of the tenets of the new school, he said: "In theory, if not in set terms, the extremists among them say: We have outgrown Shakespeare and his sixteenth century jargon and scenery; Milton and the stale classicism of 'Lycidas'; Wordsworth's dull piety, and Tennyson's tinkling sentimentalism. They tell us there shall be no sporting 'with Amaryllis in the shade' but only with her successor speaking with a foreign accent in Greenwich Village, where, moreover, there are 'tonsorial artists' to bob 'the tangles of Neaera's hair.'"

There were, apparently, some of the advocates of the ultra-modernistic school in the audience. Mr. Johnson informed them that "the metrical product of the revolutionists during the last ten years" has these general characteristics: it is unimaginative, "floundering in the bogs of the fantastic"; it is monotonously conventional, for



"nine-tenths of it might have been written by the same hand"; it is "objectionably sophisticated," it is "individualism run to seed," it is "narrow in its range, thin in its substance, and often tawdry in its sentiment."

An even more specific arraignment of the modernists who have cut the bridges of the past is made by Alfred Noyes in his recent book, "Some Aspects of Modern Poetry." He declares, most mildly, that the new poetic movement is "turning a highly organized and exquisitely developed language into what Herbert Spencer would call 'incoherent homogeneity' and what, for present purposes, we may ourselves call 'a sloppy mess.'" He disagrees frankly with those who are forever seeking "the scarlet word," who are concentrating so fiercely on the "bleak thoughts," who are pontifically declaring that "poetry must be rid of music" and who condemn an exceptionally good poem because "it is so ultra-conservative as to be grammatical."

Criticism of "modern poetry," however, cannot be made indiscriminately. While there is an extreme school that is as absurd as it is radical, there is a moderate group that is conscientiously modern the while it is sanely classical. The latter should not be condemned with the real disturbers of the poetic peace. Perhaps Mr. Johnson excluded them when he asserted that "the new school has the defect of over-accentuating a minor virtue of poetry, that it shall reflect contemporary life." Undoubtedly, he was exaggerating somewhat when he continued: "to consider the realities of the present time is one of the functions of prose, of journalism; but the chief province of poetry is to express the pervasive and permanent spiritual forces of all times."

The distinction between the time element and the eternal element in any poem is a fundamental principle, accepted by all critics. But the relative importance of these two elements in poetry is a disputable matter. In objecting to Mr. Johnson's statement that the reflection of contemporary life is a minor virtue of poetry, one does not necessarily cast aspersions on the eternal quality that a really great poem must have. True poetry is perennially vital, it appeals most directly to men of all generations. The truth of the sonnet "When to the sessions of sweet silent thought" is as incisive today as it was in Elizabeth's reign. The poignancy of "John Anderson my jo, John" is as moving to one speaking the contemporary American language as it was to a Scottish farmer of the eighteenth century. As long as birds are in the air, "Hail to thee, blithe Spirit" will remain piercingly imaginative and as long as men have ears, "Music that gentler on the spirit lies" will have power to soothe. There is a preservative in all true poetry that keeps it fresh and delectable throughout the years.

Very truly, "the province of poetry is to express the pervasive and permanent spiritual forces of all times." Poetry must give voice to the emotions that throb through all human nature, the undying loves, the hates, the sorrows

and the fears and the exultations. It must paint in undying colors the evanescent picture of one moment for all moments. It must express the experience and the wisdom of universal man in the pregnant bud of thought of one man.

Thinking in these terms, one may mesmerize oneself into a state wherein one judges poetry solely by the standard of its perennial appeal. But what may be called the ephemeral quality of poetry is a really important consideration. It is as essential for a current poem, and every poem was at one time current, as the permanent quality is for the poem that is eternal. No poet wrote primarily for the human race in its entirety or for all generations indiscriminately or for man in the abstract. He addressed himself directly to the men at his time in the flesh, to his own contemporaries. This is true both of the poet who was in rebellion to the then existing order as of the one who was perfectly attuned to the world order of his time.

No poet could, even if he desired, divorce himself from the influence of his neighbor. He used the words then current, the little nuances of phrase, the grammatical gestures. He imagined, though more vividly, as those of his period imagined; he thrilled over the same emotions in much the same way though more poignantly, being a poet; he thought according to the same processes of thought that were characteristic of his age; he was a man of his hour and his day and he could be no other. His poem was born in his present, shaped by his present and addressed to his present. That it lived beyond his present is only an added phenomenon. The ephemeral quality of a poem makes it sincere, the pervasive makes it authentic. All of which tends to show that the reflection of contemporary life is not a minor virtue of poetry.

A glance through the English tradition of poetry substantiates this contention. Literary historians have catalogued the poets according to schools and periods, that is, according to the contemporary virtue. "Merrie England" in Chaucer's time was blunt and hale and provincially sophisticated, and thus Chaucer wrote. When England grew more expansive, colorful and gorgeous, and was exultantly developing into a world empire, Shakespeare gave voice to the new era. The ages of Charles and of Cromwell cast their spell upon Milton, who was in turn the ornamental classicist and the solemn theologian. The smugness and coxcombery of the Augustans is epitomized in the couplets, epigrams and tawdry finery of Pope.

The parallel between the style of the poet and the spirit of the age runs through the nineteenth century. When the flame of revolution and the aspiration of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" were abroad in Europe, Burns sang of "universal brotherhood," Wordsworth professed an arrant democracy, Byron, Shelley and the others rebelled against law and order. With the reaction, and the Victorian concentration on external propriety, public decency, and sentimentality came Tennyson with his tearful, melodious, letter-perfect verse. Each age molded its own poets, though those poets were eternal. Each poet was instinct

with his own age, though he was attuned to all times. Each poem was, on the surface, a pattern of its year though fundamentally a model for all years.

From the foregoing, two of many possible conclusions may be drawn. The first is that the contemporary element in poetry is not such a "minor virtue." It must not be carried to an extreme, else it may render the poetry sterile, as in the case of the modern radicals. But it should energize and vitalize the poetry that is in alignment with tradition. It should be the distinguishing mark between contemporary poetry and that of the past. Tennyson, Byron, Wordsworth, Shakespeare himself, would not have written as they did if they were living now; they would have tuned the harp to the pitch of the days in which we live.

The second conclusion harks back to the second class of poetic observers left slumbering in the first paragraph. Some poetry professors declare their supreme satisfaction with, let us say, Palgrave's "Golden Treasury." They state that they need no other poems either as models or as inspirations or as illustrations for their precepts. They even condemn, all inclusively, the modern poems and poets. Their attitude is that of an instructor in clothes-designing who argues thus: clothes are intended to cover the body; all modern garments are extreme; I shall teach my pupils to fashion hoop-skirts and doublets. Or perhaps they are kinsprits with a professor of architecture who reasons: houses are intended as dwelling places; I think that the Babylonian style of the New York apartments is abominable; therefore, I shall use as the models of my instruction the moated castle of the feudal period.

FRANCIS X. TALBOT, S.J.

#### THE SPIRIT OF ST. PATRICK

"Johnny, lad, to my heart come nearer,  
Well I know what ye must say.  
Well I knew that ye would leave us,  
When the Father preached that day.

"Jesus was it, lad, Who gave thee,  
To this poor weak heart of mine,  
Jesus then may surely have thee,  
Back unto His Heart Divine.

"Mary wants to join the Sisters;  
Well then, let her to go forth.  
Souls be souls unto the Saviour,  
Be they East, West, South or North.

"Jesus wants my son, my daughter,  
Sure it's honored that I am;  
Would that I had more to give Him,  
God gave me His Only Lamb.

"Sure I know my heart is breaking,  
Hers did break beneath the Cross.  
But I will not keep Him waiting,  
And I will not count the cost.

"Mary, John, oh, come to Mother!  
Come and kiss her tears away.  
In the spirit of Saint Patrick,  
Go ye forth this blessed day."

A. F. PAGE.

#### REVIEWS

**The Mission of St. Augustine and Other Addresses.** By CARDINAL GASQUET. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

This volume contains a series of addresses which the learned Cardinal has delivered on various occasions, some even as early as 1897. They are now for the first time given to the public in printed form. They are well worth printing. The Cardinal's contribution to research in later periods of English history affects with particular authority his utterances in this department. Nearly all of these addresses contain valuable matter on English Catholic history and this is the reason given for their present appearance. The first address, an essay on the origin of the Catholic Church in England, clinches so strongly from the historical standpoint the argument of Rome that it leaves nothing further to be said about the matter. The beautiful and quiet story of the Venerable Bede is touchingly retold in the second chapter. "The Tragedy of the Reformation in Western England," illustrates from particular happenings in Cornwall and Devonshire how the poor people were brutally robbed of the heritage of the Faith by the ultra-reforming party of the reign of Edward VI. Here and in certain other chapters are introduced instances of Catholic fervor which the author has already brought forward in his "Eve of the Reformation." American Catholics will be interested in "St. Paul," the seventh address, which was delivered in the Church of the Paulist Fathers in New York on January 25, 1914. P. M. D.

**The Chief British Dramatists.** Edited by BRANDER MATTHEWS and PAUL ROBERT LIEDER. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co.

All lovers of tragedy and comedy will welcome this collection of representative writers of the drama, not alone for its historical interest but because of its literary value as well. Twenty-five plays written during the period that began in the middle of the fifteenth century and ended at the close of the nineteenth make up the volume. Shakespeare is excluded because, as we are told, he is "too varied to be represented by any single example of his work." The aim that the editors had in view when they made their selection was "to present the work of the professional players who were able to establish themselves in the theater and whose plays 'kept the stage' for years." Many plays were, of course, barred by this criterion. Even so, one meets not a few names memorable in literature, among others, Marlowe, Ben Jonson, Dryden, Goldsmith, Sheridan, Bulwer-Lytton. The short introductory essay on the theater in England will help the reader to visualize some of the conditions that governed the presentation of plays on the English stage. It is inevitable, perhaps, while reading such a collection of plays, to contrast them with the dramas of Shakespeare. They bear witness to the justice of the eulogy which Samuel Johnson passed upon him in the "Preface to an Edition of Shakespeare's Plays." Making due allowance for the slight exaggeration, Johnson was right when he deplored the fact that the passion of love was "upon every other stage the universal agent." Shakespeare, however, "knew that any other passion, as it was regular or exorbitant, was a cause of happiness or calamity." J. A. C.

**Twice Thirty.** By EDWARD W. BOK. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$4.50.

Mr. Bok has won distinction. That is, he has achieved it in the face of difficulties, opposition and competitors. Now, a man who has become thus prominent and noteworthy, has something to say that will profit others, whether they are still laboring for success, or have already reached an eminence. Mr. Bok has told us of his struggles and success, and has given us his message in "The Americanization of Edward Bok." To that instructive volume little is added by this new book, "Twice Thirty." He begins by stating that he writes to preserve a record for his sons. But, in effect, he soon loses sight of this intention, and writes for all



who will read. It is hard, even for a prominent man, to talk much about himself without verging on garrulity. Mr. Bok draws out the thread of his discourse too fine. Despite Mr. Bok's objection to the phrase, one is impressed by the saying of a certain critic that our author writes with "a simple naiveness almost childlike." At times his very seriousness furnishes an instance. For example, Mr. Bok elaborates upon the dual personality he said he observed in himself as editor and as a private individual. But the matter is simpler than that. The only psychological problem involved is the difference between his "business sense," as editor, and his inclination, at times, towards personal likes or dislikes. There is no better case for the existence of a dual personality as between Mr. Bok as editor, and Mr. Bok as a private man, than there is in the instance of a stern father who weakly yields, against his better judgment, to the persistence of his child. When a man follows his likes or dislikes in the face of reason, he displays, not a dual personality, but simply imprudence and unwise decision.

F. M.

**A Year of Prophecy.** By H. G. WELLS. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$2.00.

In this collection of fifty or more newspaper articles that he has published during the past year, Mr. Wells covers as wide a range of topics as might be expected in any authentic Wellsian effort. He expresses views on the League of Nations, Fascism and American Prohibition, on Communism and Lenin, on education, of course, on Kipling, the Wembley Exhibition, feminine influence in politics and a hundred other diverse matters. These articles are extremely interesting, because half-truths always are intriguing. And there are more half-truths in these pages than many another writer could crowd into several volumes. One cannot mistake the fact that Mr. Wells is seeking a better world and a saner method of life. He is in revolt against a great part of our modern system, right or wrong, and is wearied of it; hence, so he declares, he writes to relieve himself of its boredom. His readers, too, may be relieved if they do not take him too seriously. But therein lies a tragedy; nine out of ten readers are charmed by his chatter and fooled by his fallacies. Looking back over his career, Mr. Wells confesses that he has completed his really important literary work in his "eight and twenty fat volumes." He says something about this volume being considered an epilogue. That must be interpreted as a Wellsian half-truth; for it is unthinkable that Mr. Wells shall cease misinforming the world until he ceases to be of the world.

T. T.

**The Roar of the Crowd.** By JAMES J. CORBETT. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

When "Gentleman Jim" Corbett was in his ascendancy, a prize-fight was a mighty and a bloody battle. Corbett's first great encounter was a terrific struggle with Choynski on a raft in San Francisco Bay. Then he defeated Kilrain at New Orleans, fought a sixty-one round draw with Peter Jackson, knocked out John L. Sullivan in the twenty-first round, and finally made a fatal miscalculation with Fitzsimmons. Apart from his own record of his career, Corbett is regarded as a rather unusual man in the history of the ring. He was intelligent and gentlemanly, he was fair in his tactics and kindly in his dealings with others. He did much to make prize-fighting more decent and respectable. Just as Corbett's early successes were contrary to the predictions of the fistic czars, so his subsequent career has been out of the ordinary, for, after losing the championship he has lived as a quiet citizen, prosperous and dignified. Whatever the literary merits of this memoir may be, it has that essential quality which journalists call "human interest." For male readers, especially, even those who are not devotees of the manly art, the book will have a decided appeal.

G. C. T.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**A Book for Everygirl.**—Only one who has retained the spirit of girlhood and has joined to it the maturity of experience could understand and express so beautifully the mysteries of girl life as has Sister Eleanore, C.S.C. in "Talks with our Daughters" (Benziger, \$2.25). The book is all too small and far too short. In a series of "talks" that do not preach, this friend and teacher of girls shows the young girl how important she is to God, what her love for Jesus should be, in what way she can come nearer to the Master, and what must be her attitude towards the complex relations of life. Sister Eleanore is most direct and incisive in her chats. She is doubly persuasive in as much as she presents true ideals and does not scowl at petty faults. She woos to virtue and makes nobility attractive. While these talks are solidly spiritual, they are also based on sane common-sense and pointed by shrewd observation on the ways of the world. The readers to whom the book is addressed will certainly enjoy it; and that is high commendation.

**Educating to Purity.**—The little volume by the Rev. P. A. Beecher, D. D., "Quid Vobis Videtur" (Dublin: The Catholic Truth Society), is timely and constructive, for it exhorts priests to take up seriously and in a new way the task of educating boys to purity. Modern material conditions have multiplied social contacts between the youth of both sexes to an amazing degree. The restraints formerly accompanying these contacts have to a great extent been removed. This book is for modesty, not prudery; it gives practical examples of how young boys can be trained to purity with no loss to modesty.—Treating of drugs—opium, morphine, cocaine, heroin and hasheesh—in a little book called "The Idol" (Botwen Printing Co. \$2.00), Dr. J. Cantala shows their increasingly baleful influence upon modern life. But the book is also constructive for the author points to remedies. He shows for instance that "the profession of religious principles is undoubtedly one of the strongest barriers checking the development of drug addiction." The style is somewhat exaggerated and the language is, at times, intemperate.

**One Shepherd and One Flock.**—From the Oxford University Press comes "Documents on Christian Unity. 1920-24" (\$2.50), seventy pieces in all, reflecting in a remarkable manner the post-war development of the long-standing movement toward Christian Unity. These documents, covering most countries, and, besides the Catholic Church, nearly all the sects, have for a Catholic this interest, that they portray what we feel is the first step to the end so much desired, namely, a deep sense of the scandal of a Christendom, divided in Faith and jurisdiction. The next step, and the decisive one, is hardly noticed in these papers, the clear recognition of the exclusive claims of the Church united with the Bishop of Rome to be the identical historical Church founded by Christ Himself. These papers, however, give some ground for hoping that the day that step is taken may not after all be so far from dawning.—One disturbing symptom in present-day religion of a state of mind far removed from Unity is the presence of that malady known as Modernism. This is well-illustrated in "The Faith of Modernism" (Macmillan, \$1.50), by Dr. Shailer Mathews. The remarkable part of this work, as of so many like it, is that a Catholic finds himself in agreement with nearly all the general aims the Modernist describes himself as striving to attain. Any true religion must meet the religious needs of modern men and women. Miracles must be subjected to rigid scientific tests to see if they really happened. It is not peculiar to Modernism to seek reform in economic and social matters. And so of nearly all his general assumptions and expressed aims. Moreover, one cannot help feeling that in criticizing what he takes to be Christianity, Dr. Mathews is criticizing only that deformation of Christianity

known as Protestantism, which he mistakes for Christianity itself. If he would but follow his own excellent principles, which he naively imagines to be peculiar to Modernism, he would find himself a Catholic, but for one thing. But that thing makes him a Modernist, namely, a stubborn subjectivism, which makes its own religious truth, instead of going out to find it where alone religious truth is, in that authority actually set up in the world by God Himself.

**Medieval Mystics.**—The fourth of a series of little volumes called "The Orchard Books" has appeared under the title "The Cloud of Unknowing" (Benziger, \$1.65), edited by Dom Justin McCann. This work is generations old, having been written in the fourteenth century by an English mystic who has concealed his name. There is a quaint and simple flavor of otherworldliness and piety clinging to many of these old-time writings that have a charm of originality and sweetness. So it is here. There are passages of this work that recall "The Following of Christ," others that bear a close resemblance to the enunciation of certain principles later set forth in the "Spiritual Exercises" of St. Ignatius. Two other small treatises by the same unknown author are added, together with a commentary on "The Cloud of Unknowing" by Father Baker, O. S. B., a spiritual writer of the seventeenth century.—Principles of the spiritual life compressed by a medieval saint into small paragraphs are gathered together in a little book called "Sayings of Saint Catherine" (Benziger, \$1.75). It is Catherine of Sienna who composed these pithy periods; they are arranged for every day of the year.

**Humorous Critics.**—In "A Last Scrap Book" (Macmillan), Mr. Saintsbury offers old friends (and enemies!) a third and positively final volume of whimsical miscellany. An article on "Copeck" explodes a deal of caustic irony against that unfortunately bootless institution. Another on Byron, contesting the poetic grounds of that poet's extravagant cult, is the best in the book. Mr. Saintsbury is always better when he talks literature or school matters, being too weak a theologian and statesman to discuss Church and State. Yet, this "*plusquam-septuagenarian* Tory schoolmaster, journalist, and professor," is neither unlikable nor eversive. The right kind of reader will find him in his last, as in his preceding two gestures, delightfully amusing.—Smiling and laughing humor of another kind is to be had in the "Selected Works" (Boni, Liveright, \$2.00), of Artemus Ward. The book contains fifty humorous selections. A preface by Albert J. Nock gives a good appreciation of Charles Farrar Browne, better known as Artemus Ward. He died at thirty-three, but his works are still vital. He was not only humorist, but critic; and it is as a humorous critic that Mr. Nock views him, basing the selection of his work on Ward's analytical power. This book belongs to the series "The American Library."

**The Play's the Thing.**—Of the three plays mentioned here "The Guardsman" (Boni, Liveright, \$2.00), by Franz Molnar, stands alone in its claim to distinction if plot and character are the central elements of appeal. It is a comedy whose action revolves about the ardent and jealous affection of an actor husband for his actress wife, whom he suspects of having grown tired of him. He masks as a Russian guardsman and woos his wife in this guise. Through many subtly amusing situations we are left in doubt as to whether the wife is succumbing to the wooing of the guardsman or is simply playing with him. Nor is this doubt removed at the issue of the play, in spite of the wife's assertion that she discerned the mask and was but playing her part with

her husband. Such double interpretations are not rare in the Molnar drama.—The doggedness and independence of an unscrupulous old aristocrat in his last decrepit days are represented in "Old English" (Scribners, \$1.00), by John Galsworthy. The dogged Englishman hurls defiance at all the world and ends his days in bestial helplessness over the wineglass. We cannot admire a character whose independence runs rough-shod over others' rights and which owns no higher law than itself. The plot is very thinly woven and lacks interest.—The name gives a clue to the plot of the third play: "There Came Two Women" (Bobbs Merrill), by Herbert Quick. One of the women is married but sterile and she ardently longs to give birth to a child. The other, though unmarried, is a mother, and she is forced to leave her child temporarily in the care of an unscrupulous nurse in the maternity hospital. The nurse sells this child to the motherless woman. Later the mother and father of the child seek the baby and find it when it has just died. There are moments of real pathos in the play, and yet, while the plot possesses interest, it is sometimes crude in its technic and unconvincing in its characterization.

**Fiction.**—Miss Smith, sublimest of Anglicans, and Dr. G'Malley, papist when intoxicated but atheist when sober, together with some forty orphans of both sexes are shipwrecked in the Southern Pacific and settle upon an uninhabited island. Three quarters of a century later, a rescue party reaches the exiles. Such is the curtain-raiser in Rose Macaulay's latest book "Orphan Island" (Boni, Liveright, \$2.00). Undoubtedly, the story deserves to have as many readers as Miss Macaulay's "Told by an Idiot" and "Potterism." It is charged with humorous satire and irony. While describing the people stranded on the South Pacific island and their customs, Miss Macaulay is grimacing at the social, political, educational, religious and economic life of the dwellers on the British Isles. It is done cleverly and with insight. What Miss Macaulay writes about the Catholics is hardly to be taken as her own opinion, for she is far too intelligent to believe such stupid nonsense. Her remarks are evidently to be understood as satire on the blind prejudice of a certain class of the English Victorians.

Nine short stories of high merit are contained in "The Grub Street Nights Entertainments" (Doran, \$2.50), by J. C. Squire. The source of all the tales is the world of modern literature in the making. The artist and the near-artist, the free-verse maker, the lecturer and the critic are portrayed to the finger-tips, for the creator of these stories is a man who knows the literary types. There is a blandness and a gentle humor in all of these sketches that make them most attractive. "The Man Who Wrote Free Verse" excels in these qualities; this tale, as well as all the others, ends with a quick turn of meaning.

The newest story of the late Louis Hémon is entitled "Blind Man's Buff" (Macmillan, \$2.00). It is a fine piece of writing, such as one would expect from the author of "Maria Chapdelaine." It recounts the experiences of an Irish laborer on the London docks, the struggles of a man who is striving to balance the inequalities of life. This man is at odds with the world, he grasps one straw after another, broods over his wrongs, and suffers as only a baffled soul can suffer. That he does not attain the happiness which his discarded religion would have brought him is to be regretted. Hémon forgets the appeal of the Catholic faith. However, the story is strong in theme and artistic in execution.

After finishing "Nora Pays" (Stokes, \$2.00), by Lucille Van Slyke, the reader will probably lay aside the book with a feeling of bewilderment. What is it all about and what is its significance? A woman abandons her three little girls; she returns to them when they are young women; she disappears once more when the daughters are settled in life and death. The probabilities are strained to the breaking point and the "humanness" which the blurb features is not apparent. The story is clean, and that, at least, is a recommendation.



## Sociology

## Automatic Heart-Valves and Educated Tear-Ducts

IN his latest book Irvin Cobb presents a gentleman, equipped with automatic heart-valves and educated tear-ducts. Don't say you never heard of such a creature. I am sure there is at least one in your block, and with his almost innumerable brothers, and especially sisters, he forms the most powerful force at work in America today.

Once upon a time we were ruled by the Constitution. For a few hectic years we were kept in line by the Big Stick, which was flourished ferociously but rarely broke a head. Now we are misgoverned by the man with the automatic heart-valves and the educated tear-ducts. He led the van in the fight for votes for women, and where the battle raged most hotly for prohibition, his helm and plume were seen where the fiercest prattled. He is now nursing wounds received in the temporary reverse of the Child-Labor amendment and the Sterling-Reed bill. He is a bit sore, too, because his mouthpiece, Senator Sterling, is no longer a Senator but an assistant editor on the staff of that exponent of Ku Klux Klan insanities, the *Fellowship Forum*. But do not forget that he is still the man with the automatic heart-valves and the educated tear-ducts, the peerless propagandist, the peddler of bunk, which is grammatically a short form for buncombe but actually a tremendous power in public life.

"Bunk" in its purest form is something that does not deliberately intend to be dishonest, but is. Some months ago I was permitted to remark in these pages that anyone with a troupe of performing propagandists at his disposal, together with an imposing letter-head and a list of patrons, could free every canary bird in this great country from its fetters of thralldom, or from whatever it is that debars these tiny songsters, (or to dyspeptics, infernal nuisances), from enjoying the rights secured by the Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence. These men and women, all fitted with the latest model of automatic valves and ducts would careen throughout the land like Paul Revere through Middlesex, awakening calloused citizens to a sense of their iniquity in condemning our oriflamme brothers and sisters to a life which can know nothing more uplifting than a scuttle of medicated bird-seed and a dilapidated piece of cuttlebone. They could make more ado over the disabilities of a canary bird, than any Abolitionist in the old days before propaganda and bunk began to rule the country, ever dared suggest over the woes of Dred Scott and his interesting family. On second thought, I believe I selected the goldfish as the outstanding example of unmerited captivity; but goldfish or canary-birds, our propagandist could release all, down to the last fin and feather, once he set his valves and ducts to the job. For no argument is so powerful in America as the appeal addressed neither to sentiment

nor sensibility, but flung at our ripe-to-rotteness sentimentality.

In the days of his callow youth, David Belasco disclosed through a popular magazine those devices of the dramatist which would at once bring forth a laugh or evoke a sob. Let us rehearse one or other situation good for a geyser of tears. Little Ellie (a term of endearment merely, for this lady who developed her muscle by devotion to the chores of a Vermont farm, has seen all of twenty summers),—little Ellie has been cast forth into the cold night by her cruel parents, while the violins with muted strings croon and wail their sympathy. Perhaps it's because she refuses to marry old Obadiah Checkerbury, who holds a moggidge, by Heck, on the paternal mansion. Perhaps, to phrase a delicate situation in rustic terms, "that city feller hain't done right by our Nell." But, as the audience knows well, full six months before, the little mountain flower, as she is fondly known in these parts, went down to good old Parson Moody's to be united with John Armstrong, the young city feller, in the bonds of matrimony. But, hist, no others must know. There is a will which says that he may not marry before the age of sixty, or such time as he shall have attained the age of reason, (which makes a celibate of him forthwith), or the property reverts to the State. The stage knows no Blackstone, especially in melodrama. Hence when little Ellie, after raising her pale, wan countenance to the pitiless sky, staggers off into the night while the winds obligingly whistle and sigh and do all that is *de rigueur*, there isn't a dry eye in all the house. Of course, everybody knows that little Ellie will fall into the arms of her proud young husband before she reaches Squire Hazen's ten-acre lot, but what is as pleasant as a good cry? Then all will flop back through the snow just in time to confound old Obadiah Checkerbury, who has selected that moment to foreclose the moggidge by putting the remaining members of the family out into the howling blast. The young husband has just skinned a number of those city fellers in a Wall Street transaction, and need no longer worry about the will. He announces his intention of remaining on the farm which, fondly, he deems an easier task than Wall Street, and all ends happily.

The tactics of the melodramatist have long been commonplaces with the propagandists. There is Mr. Arthur Brisbane, for instance, whose automatic valves and ducts can work with all the smoothness of a Corliss engine: dilating on the Child-Labor amendment, he links in one accord subjects as widely diverse as Sèvres and limburgers. The whole country is aflame with sympathy, he writes, because Floyd Collins has been caught in a cave fifty feet below ground. But that same country has no sympathy with children forced to work in mines one hundred feet below daylight. A typical child-labor argument this, and it caused the tears to gush from many a tender eye. But it was "bunk," pure bunk. Then there is Mr. Hearst's

chief cartoonist in the pre-bonus period. Day after day this gentleman drew his inspiration from the concept of a broken veteran humbly holding out his hat for alms from a public that passed him by without a glance. Or he sat near the gutter, legless, sightless, with his pitiful little stock of shoestrings and lead-pencils. "Don't you want to help him?" was the tenor of the inscriptions for these cartoons. The only story told by them was that the bonus bill was a special provision for the relief of the wounded soldier, whereas, in fact, it was not and was never intended to be anything of the kind.

As for prohibition, who can forget the flood of tears released from educated ducts during more than two generations! Who has not thrilled to the measure of "Father, dear father, come home with me now," as little Mary, struck down by a drunken father, pleads for his return from a barroom where he is again sating himself with rum? Who has not wept over little Somebody-or-other who pressed her wan face against the window-pane and kept it there for years? And would not these lines start hardened valves and bring th' unbidden tear:

Say, boys, if you'll give me another \* \* \* \* \* I'll be glad,  
And I'll draw right here a picture of the face that drove me mad.  
Give me that piece of chalk with which you mark the billiard  
score

You shall see the lovely Madeline's picture, right here on the  
barroom floor.

"\* \* \* \* \*" represents a word deleted by the censor. The first letter is "w" and it stands for a drink, once sold in saloons, but now obtainable at teas, dinners, and most social functions, especially those frequented by young people.

Well, what is the moral? Women must weep and men must work, wrote the deluded Kingsley, but today we must all weep if we are to "put over" legislation. Niobe is in high honor, but this unfortunate tendency of the American people to call on their sob-valves when they ought to use their brains, threatens to kill many a needed social reform. It has all but ruined the parole and probation system. It has seriously impeded the reform that is undoubtedly necessary in our penal institutions. It throws a shadow of doubt over the juvenile court. It has cluttered up our statute-books with thousands of laws, the result of lachrymose delirium, which can never end the evil against which they are ostensibly directed because they can never be enforced. When a man gets over a good cry, he is very apt to be ashamed of himself.

This is a hard old world, and I have no word of reproach for the tender-hearted. A soft heart and a hard head is a combination for which a man should thank God daily on his knees. He who has them is a leader. But we have given ourselves to leaders the softness of whose hearts is exceeded only by the softness of their heads.

JOHN WILTBYE.

## Education

### Dr. Meiklejohn's "New College"

AT a time when the future of higher education seems particularly unpromising, it is of importance to observe that one of the foremost American educators raises his voice in protest and proposes a remedy in the form of a number of highly interesting suggestions. "The besetting difficulty of the colleges just now is confusion," writes Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn in the *Century Magazine* for January. "They are acquiring many millions of dollars and are doing many hundreds of things. But in the midst of it all there is a conviction of relative futility, of scattering of effort." No country in the world has more colleges, or finer colleges from a mere material point of view, than the United States, and yet, in these institutions, as Dr. Meiklejohn implies, results in the way of general culture and scholarship are far from what they should be.

Of the many reasons for this failure of the American College to achieve the supreme purpose of its existence, one of the most potent is, undoubtedly, the false belief, so prevalent nowadays, that the acquisition of specialized knowledge is education. Confusion has resulted from an endeavor to make education coincide with the ever-increasing field of human achievement. "Something of everything, and everything of something," has been the motto of the founders of the present system. Dr. Meiklejohn professes to be highly dissatisfied with this view of the matter. In distinguishing between knowledge and instruction he not only admits the facts of the case, but allows himself to be led into a far more forceful admission. "Our knowledge," he writes, "has become a great conglomeration of special studies. Meanwhile, in the college, instruction has been dragged along, as it were, at the tail, or, shall we say, at the tails of this comet. *We no longer have, if we ever had, instruction in intelligence. We have now instruction in a number of subjects.*" (Italics inserted).

To remedy this evil, Dr. Meiklejohn proposes an experiment—the establishment of "A New College." He finds an ardent desire for it among teachers and students from one end of the country to the other. For the making of the venture he would have a small college with not more than twenty-five or thirty teachers and two hundred and fifty or three hundred students. The college should be small in order that the faculty may be small, and the faculty must be small to work together. From the wasting of effort "only one body can save us, and that is the faculty"—a faculty which will be a "coherent, self-determining body, definitely committed to a well formulated purpose, and directing all its efforts, individual and corporate, to the realization of that purpose." Apparently, after millions of dollars spent in futile experiment, it is, at last, becoming evident that neither the board of trustees, nor the alumni, nor the student body can build a successful college. All these, no doubt, have their place, but their purpose is not educational.



In the matter of scholarly ideals, to be incorporated into his "New College," Dr. Meiklejohn explains as follows. The professors, who, at present, compose a college faculty have two important tasks to accomplish, the making of knowledge, and the instruction of youth. "It is clear that these two functions cannot be separated. We cannot have two sets of institutions, one in which learning is made and another in which learning is taught."

Young people of college age must be instructed in learning by those who are making it. Every member of a faculty must, then, be equipped to play some part in these attempts at understanding upon which our human living rests. But at the same time he must be ready to take into association with him young men and women who are to be trained in those ways of right thinking which he himself practises. College education, like all other genuine education, comes from the contact of a growing mind with one which is worthy of imitation and which compels it. *Our colleges are responsible for seeing to it that young men and women think about the right things and that they think about them well. Young people, whether they are to be scholars or not, must develop the kind of intelligence which springs from scholarship.* (Italics inserted). It would be difficult to give a better outline of the purpose of college education than that contained in these last few words. As a preliminary reform Dr. Meiklejohn would abolish the lecture system.

Dr. Meiklejohn decidedly disapproves of another feature of modern education. Of the elective system he writes:

This system, or lack of system, rests upon a principle, or lack of principle, which is the negation of coherence in instruction. Its dictum is, "Any subject properly studied will give liberal education." It is as true as the statement that any food properly chewed is a sufficient diet. In either case, the application of the principle leads to malnutrition and deformity.

He considers the failure of the elective system to be the natural consequence of an educational practise too prone to regard knowledge as a group of absolutely distinct subjects. He points out that, of late, in many colleges this defect has been recognized, and courses, called "orientation courses" have been established, whose purpose is to show that a certain relationship exists between the different branches of knowledge. But these are, as yet, "make-shifts," which have only in a limited degree answered the end for which they were intended.

Dr. Meiklejohn believes the real difficulty to lie deeper, in the sharp and irreconcilable divergences *actually* existing between the "subjects," as specialists are wont to consider them. He does not think any system will work as long as one adheres to a division of knowledge so artificial. He proposes for freshman class, instead of the study of particular "subjects," the study of a civilization, and for sophomore class the study of an entirely different civilization, e.g., Greek civilization of the golden age, as contrasted with English or American civilization of the last century. The first two years of college would thus be devoted to the most liberal of studies, literature, history, philosophy, the fine arts, and from a close application to these marked benefits in thought and culture would of necessity result. In junior and senior years, while it is desirable to preserve a certain continuity in these studies,

the way ought to be opened again to the sciences and specialized subjects, which would then impress themselves with new significance on the enlightened consciousness of liberally educated men.

Such, in general, are the most striking of Dr. Meiklejohn's proposals. Extremely liberal, in tone, they seem, in reality, to *imply* the need of a return to saner ideals. Surely Dr. Meiklejohn's "venture" is not so "new" as he would have us suppose. Many of the principles he enunciates are as conservative as can be found in the whole history of education. One is a little surprised to see him insisting on the advantage of a small college, in which the faculty is in full control of affairs, and in which the professors work together to a common end, as if such schools had never existed. Even the most startling of his suggestions, that, namely, concerning the study of a civilization rather than distinct "subjects" in freshman and sophomore years, loses many of its astonishing qualities when one realizes the purpose underlying it. Who will not grant that it is all important for the future specialist to receive the essentials of a liberal education? or that it has been from lack of such training that scientists in general have been unsolicitous about coordinating the various departments of knowledge? Yet it is perfectly evident a two year survey of a field that ordinarily requires at least six years of profound study will not much remedy matters. Besides, a course that professes to cover the essentials of Athenian civilization in a year—even with all the aid of modern bookmaking in the form of translations, digests of authors, opinions of critics—must arouse more than a suspicion of superficiality. The same may be said, in a lesser degree, of the proposed course in English and American civilization. At best, one might hope for the satisfaction of a good deal of curiosity, and the acquisition of a little knowledge. But of intellectual discipline, like to that afforded by a serious study of the ancient classics, there would be nothing.

The fact is that, with the best of intentions, Dr. Meiklejohn and American educators generally have long been searching about for an *easy* road to culture and scholarship. Determined to find some way of making learning readily accessible to everyone, their very fidelity of purpose has obscured from them the danger of merely dragging down excellence to the level of mediocrity.

What American colleges need, at present, is not that study be made easier, but that teachers be made to *teach* (not to lecture or experiment), and that students be made to *study*.

RAYMOND J. GRAY, S.J.

## Notes and Comment

An Apology  
Recorded

IN its current issue the *Ladies' Home Journal* prints a note of regret and apology for the grotesque account of the Immaculate Conception by Mr. E. V. Lucas in its December number. With the apology the magazine in-

cludes a letter from Father Thurston, S.J., the distinguished research-writer of London, instructing Mr. Lucas on the truth of the matter. Father Thurston closes with words with which all will agree: "May I add that I quite understand that what Mr. Lucas has written was written in all good faith and without any idea of exploiting anti-Catholic prejudice?" The incident is closed, but conveys a lesson nevertheless. Mr. Lucas records that he took his information from a source which he believed to be sound. Catholics have long since learned from bitter experience how many "standard" histories, even histories of art, contain things no less absurd than what Mr. Lucas found in his sources. The least they ask is that on Catholic matters Catholic sources be consulted, to control the information purveyed by the other sources.

#### High School Prize Essay Contest

**A**S an aid to the promotion of good, intelligent citizenship, the Knights of Columbus have authorized the holding of a prize essay contest open to all junior and senior high-school students, both public and private, the subject being "The Constitution of the United States in Its Making." The time limit for handing in the essays is April 15. Three prizes will be awarded: \$75 for the first; \$50 for the second, and \$5 for the third. A neat folder giving all the details of the contest can be had from the K. of C. headquarters, New Haven, Conn.; or from the various district assemblies of the Fourth Degree. No better topic could be chosen. Tinkering the Constitution is one of the demoralizing fads of the day, and the rising generation can well begin to learn from the records of the past what a precious heritage has come down to them in the charter of our liberties, and with what labor and skill it was wrought. Catholic principles, and immediate Catholic effort, played no small part in the results attained. This is a phase not too well developed in current historical records. Its demonstration should be a gratifying and instructive incident of this contest initiated by the Knights of Columbus.

#### The Immaculate Conception Again

**T**HE *Living Church* is authority for the statement that a discussion is "gently raging" among Protestants of New York over the Immaculate Conception. This Episcopalian weekly's remarks on the matter are interesting for several things. First, here is a non-Catholic paper which knows what the Immaculate Conception really is, namely, Mary's freedom from original sin. Secondly the *Living Church* rejects that dogma, and relegates it to the stage of "devout speculation," which the *Living Church* may very well do, on the Protestant principle of private judgment. It does not, however, advert to the basis of the truth of the Church's belief in the Blessed

Virgin's prerogative. Neither does it refer to the manner in which the Church teaches that dogma to have been revealed by God, namely, as implicitly revealed in the dogma of original sin, taken in conjunction with certain passages of the Old and New Testament. Least of all does it remark that it is precisely the function of a living, infallible teaching body, such as Christ contemplated, to develop into explicitness what was formally implicit in God's Revelation. Catholics, however, will fully agree with the *Living Church's* retort to those Modernists who deny the Immaculate Conception. Modernists, it observes, generally reject the doctrine of original sin altogether. What right, then, have they to deny the Immaculate Conception of Mary, when they demand an immaculate conception for everybody else? Why deny that Mary was conceived without original sin, when they claim that all men are born and conceived without original sin?

#### Crime Wave and Improper Films

**P**OWER to eliminate public exhibition of pictures made by criminals or persons recognized to possess debased characters was asked in the report made lately to the New York Legislature by the State Motion Picture Commission. Commenting on this subject various Brooklyn judges condemned the present motion pictures as crime-breeding and a menace to the morals of the community. "Most of the moving pictures are salacious and vicious," said County Judge G. W. Martin. Their effect can only be to entice the young into the road that leads to ruin. "These pictures glorify crime or depict the rotten trail of sensuality." The moral tagged to them, he concluded, offers no relief. Similarly County Judge Franklin Taylor finds that "the modern picture is sensual, and nothing demoralizes more than sensuality." To see the modern movies, he holds, one would come to the conclusion that there was no censorship in the State of New York. "At the movies the young see things they never should be allowed even to hear or think about. Under such conditions the downfall of young girls is not remote." Similarly he finds the spoken drama outrivaling Paris in indecency. County Judge A. G. McLoughlin was no less plainspoken. Most of the photoplays of the present time, he holds, should never be exhibited before the eyes of the young, and for that matter are unfit also for the eyes of adults.

We have a censorship, but the type of pictures allowed to be exhibited would indicate that the remedy does not lie in censorship. The remedy could be found in an aroused public opinion, which could be brought about through the agency of the pulpit and the press.

These statements are from men of practical experience, not given to exaggeration. They are of interest for the entire country. The increase in crime among the young has been too terrible to be disregarded.